DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 928 HE 025 691

AUTHOR Cowart, Susan Cooper
TITLE What Works in Student Retention in State Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa. National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 168p.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; College Freshmen; Data Collection; Enrollment; Higher Education; Program Descriptions; Public Schools; *School Activities; *School Holding Power; School Role; State Schools; *Student Attrition; Student School Relationship; Surveys; Withdrawal (Education)
IDENTIFIERS *American Association of State Colleges and Univs

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a survey of member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) concerning administration views on student retention, and student retention and attrition and campus responses to this problem. Retention Activity Reports for each responding institution (N=183) are provided. Each activity report lists the target group, the retention activity, impacts on both the target group and institution, and initiation of action. Among the survey's findings are the following: (1) almost all member institutions had implemented programs or have been engaged in activities during the 1980s aimed at increasing retention; (2) entering (new) students remain the most frequently mentioned target group for retention activities; (3) problems most often encountered by AASCU institutions involved in retention activities are the same as those reported in the 1979 survey, but a higher percentage of AASCU institutions identify with each of the problems or retention inhibitors than was the case for four-year public institutions in the previous survey; and (4) AASCU respondents to this retention survey rate the importance of positive factors on their campuses, those associated with greater retention, in just about the same relative order as respondents from the four-year public institutions in the 1979 survey. Appendices include the survey instrument. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347928

What Works

IN STUDENT RETENTION IN STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

SUSAN COOPER COWART

A cooperative project of the ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities

HE 025 691

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ACT & AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Works

IN STUDENT RETENTION IN STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

SUSAN COOPER COWART

A cooperative project of the ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities

The ACT NATIONAL CENTER for the Advancement of Educational Practices

ACT

aascu

© 1987 The American College Testing Program. All Rights Reserved.

Table of Contents

List of Tables v

Acknowledgements vii

Background of the Study 1

Summary Statements 3

Descriptive Data on the Institutions in the Survey 7

- Respondents 7
- Enrollment and Attrition 7

Campus Studies and Analyses of Retention and Attrition 21

- Analysis on Campus 2
- The Attrition Milieu 22
- The Retention Milieu 23
- Student Dropout Potential 24
- Summary of Attrition and Retention Factors 25

Campus Organization for Retention 33

- Retention Coordination 33
- Steering Committees 33
- Initial Moving Force 34
- Problems Encountered 34

Action Programs Since 1980 41

Analyzing the Impact of Freshman Attrition Rates 45

- Analysis on Campus 45
- The Attrition Milieu 46
- The Retention Milieu 46
- Dropout Indicators 47
- Campus Organization for Retention 47
- Problems Encountered 47
- Specific Retention Activities 48

Analyzing the Impact of Campus Organization for Retention 57

Analysis on Campus 58
The Attrition Milieu 58
The Retention Milieu 59
Dropout Indicators 60
Reporting Line for Retention Coordinator 60
Initial Moving Force 60
Problems Encountered 60
Specific Retention Activities 61

Activity Report Forms 71

Summary of Retention Activities by Target Groups 71

Activity Report Forms: Examples of Retention Strategies 77

Appendices 127

References 145

List of Tables

Table 1	Titles of Respondents	10
Table 2	Percentage of Full-time Entering Freshmen Not Enrolled One Year Later, On Average	11
Table 3	Actual or Estimated Figures Used in Table 2	11
Table 4	Number of New Freshmen (Full-Time Only) Enrolled 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983	12
Table 5	Percentage of New Full-Time Freshmen Enrolled One Year Later: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983	13
Table 6	Percentage of New Full-Time Freshmen Enrolled Two Years Later: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983	14
Table 7	Total Number of Full-Time Students: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983	15
Table 8	Percentage of Distribution of Total Full-Time Enrollment of Institutions: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983	16
Table 8-A	Full-Time Enrollment: Total Membership vs. Respondents	17
Table 9	Percentage of Total Enrollment that is Full-Time: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983	18
Table 10	Percentage of Total Enrollment that is Part-Time: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983	19
Table 11	Enrollment Data are Actual Figures or Estimates	19
Table 12	Campus Studies and Analyses of Retention and Attrition	26
Table 13	Groups Surveyed in Analysis of Retention	26

Table 14 Reason for Which No Survey was Included in Analysis of Retention 27

Table 15 Average Ratings of Importance of Negative Campus Characteristics 28

Table 16 Average Ratings of Importance of Positive Campus Characteristics 29

Table 17 Mean Rating of Student Characteristics Relative to Dropout Potential 30

Table 18 Most Important Factors in Student Retention: Rank Order of Mean Ratings 31

Table 19 Coordinator of Retention Activities 35

Table 20 Reporting Line of Retention Coordinator (only for institutions having coordinator) 36

Table 21 Institution Has (Had) Retention Steering Committee 37

Table 22 Number Having Served on Retention Steering Committee by Position of Members 37

Table 23 Initial Moving Force Behind Institution's Retention Effort 38

Table 24 Problems Encountered by Retention Effort (by Frequency of Response) 39

Table 25 Activities to Improve Retention Since 1980 43

Table 26 Average Freshman-To-Sophomore Attrition Rate 49

Table 27 Campus Organization for Retention 62

Table 28 Satisfaction and Effectiveness Ratings of Retention Activities 75

Table 29 Evaluation Rates for Activity Report Forms 78

Acknowledgements

This report presents the results of a survey conducted by the Academic Affairs Resource Center (AARC) of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). Nilda Rendino, Senior Program Associate at the AARC, served as project coordinator. She wishes to thank the following for help and assistance: the American College Testing Program (ACT) and the National Center for Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) for allowing AASCU to use and revise the original What Works in Student Retention (WWISR) survey instrument (Beal and Noel: 1980); Robert Reid, Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Southern Indiana and Ron Eaglin, Chancellor at the Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina, for initiating the project on behalf of the AARC; Evelyn Hively, Meredith Ludwig, and Michael Rendino for assisting with various phases of the project. And, she extends a special "thank you" to Richard Rowray, Director of ACT's National Center, who helped develop the cooperative arrangement, to the author who directed ACT's part of the project, and to other staff of ACT who assisted in this project.

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance, as well as the patience, of Nilda Rendino and her staff at AASCU. Scott Van Fossen of ACT's Information Services Division (ISD) formatted the data for processing at the Weeg Computing Center of the University of Iowa. Diana Saluri, publications specialist for the National Center, edited the manuscript. She also helped devise the classification scheme for the activity report forms, classified the reports and did much of the work on selecting exemplary reports for publication. Ron McClellen, Graphic Artist and Assistant Director in Publications, designed the cover. Julie Coon, also of ISD, entered the tables and text on ACT's word processing system, and Donna Appleglise of the National Center made the final revisions, as well as style and formatting changes. Diane Slaughter, also of the National Center, retyped the activity report forms. My special thanks to James Maxey, Director and Senior Research Scientist and to David Crockett, Vice President for Public Affairs who read the manuscript and made substantive recommendations.

Background of the Study

In May 1985 AASCU polled the senior academic officers of its member institutions to determine the five issues of major concern to them. Demographics and retention topped the list overall. "Serving the Changing Student Population: Models for Success" was selected by a planning committee to be the 1985-86 topic for the work of AASCU's Academic Affairs Resource Center.

The Academic Affairs Resource Center works through center associates--the chief academic officers of member institutions. During the year of focusing on this topic, a series of five meetings were held throughout the country, and each meeting targeted a different segment of the student population for study and discussion: women, blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians, traditional students, nontraditional students, and "place-bound" students. At the close of the series of meetings, some of the participants suggested that it would be helpful to have an update for AASCU institutions of the sort of information presented in the 1980 report What Works in Student Retention (WWISR) which was based on a national survey conducted by the American College Testing Program (ACT) and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS).

Permission was obtained to use the WWISR survey instrument, and in May 1986 the revised version was mailed to senior academic officers at AASCU institutions. One hundred and ninety of the 370 member institutions responded in time to be included in the analysis, and 183 of the completed questionnaires were usable. That is a response rate of 50 percent.

The data tape was sent to Susan Cooper Cowart, Research Specialist at the ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices, who processed the data, performed the data analysis, and wrote this report.

Summary Statements

- Almost all AASCU institutions included in this report have implemented programs or have been engaged in activities during the 1980s aimed at increasing retention.

  -- Over one-half of the AASCU institutions have had a retention steering committee compared to only about one-third for the institutions in the 1979 survey.

  -- Only for studies of retention is no increase in activity found for AASCU institutions surveyed in 1986 relative to four-year public institutions in 1979.

- More of the AASCU institutions participating in the 1986 survey are involved in more activities aimed at improving retention than was the case for the 221 four-year public institutions surveyed by ACT and NCHEMS.

  -- All institutions having a retention coordinator report that some activities or programs aimed at increasing retention have been implemented on their campuses.

- More than one-half (56 percent) of the AASCU respondents are from institutions that have no retention coordinator. Two-thirds of the respondents from four-year public institutions were from campuses having no one to coordinate retention in the 1979 national survey.

  -- The most active campuses are those that have assigned a new position or one existing staff to coordinate retention duties. Only the institutions that have no retention coordinator report that their campuses have not been involved in special programs to increase retention.

- Entering (new) students remain the most frequently mentioned target group for retention activities. Twenty-five percent of the reports from AASCU institutions describe activities targeted at entering students; only 18 percent of the reports from comparable institutional types in the 1979 survey were for new students.

  -- Low freshman attrition rates are associated with a higher rate of retention activity and high freshman attrition rates with less involvement in retention activities.

-- Fully two-thirds of the respondents in this survey indicate that they have come to expect an average freshman attrition rate of 25 to 50 percent.

-- One-year retention rates for full-time freshmen at AASCU institutions are lower than the rates for all four-year public institutions in the 1979 national retention survey, but they are 3 or 4 percentage points higher than reported by those four-year public institutions with open admissions policies.

-- Two-year retention rates for full-time freshmen at AASCU institutions are also lower than for four-year public institutions in 1979, but the AASCU rates are as much as 6 or 7 points higher if the comparison is made to open admissions institutions in the earlier survey. (Note, however, that fewer than 20 open admissions institutions reported data there.)

- Problems most often encountered by AASCU institutions involved in retention activities are the same as those reported in the 1979 survey, but a higher percentage of AASCU institutions identify with each of the problems or retention inhibitors than was the case for four-year public institution in the previous survey.

- Institutions having a retention coordinator are most likely to have assigned the duties to an existing staff position. Relatively few institutions have created a new position to coordinate retention activities on campus.

  -- Having assigned coordination responsibilities does not assure that fewer problems will be encountered in the retention efforts. Institutions using staff from several areas to coordinate retention efforts report the highest rate of problems--higher than institutions with no retention coordinator.

- Inadequate academic advising is once again found to have the highest importance rating of all attrition-related characteristics of campuses. AASCU institutions attach considerably more importance to the negative impact of "economic" factors--inadequate financial aid, inadequate part-time employment opportunities, and job-class scheduling conflicts--than did the four-year public institutions surveyed in 1979.

  -- AASCU respondents from institutions having assigned retention coordination duties to staff in several areas give highest average importance ratings to more negative (attrition-related) factors than respondents from schools having any other arrangement for retention coordination, including those having no retention coordinator. Conversely, institutions having assigned retention coordination duties to only one existing staff position most often assign the lowest average importance to these negative factors about their campuses.

- AASCU respondents to this retention survey rate the importance of positive factors on their campuses--those associated with greater retention--in just about the same relative order as respondents from the four-year public institutions in the 1979 survey.

  -- Respondents from institutions assigning retention coordination to one existing staff give the highest importance ratings to more positive, i.e. retention-related, campus factors than any other organizational arrangement examined.

  -- Institutions with high freshman attrition rates perceive negative campus characteristics--those often found to be associated with attrition--to be very important, and they tend to rate positive characteristics--those usually associated with retention--as having low importance on their campuses.

- While AASCU respondents tend to give a higher rating to the importance of the indicators of dropout potential, the findings of this study reveal that AASCU respondents place the same relative importance ordering on these dropout factors as was found for four-year public institutions in 1979.

Descriptive Data on the Institutions in the Survey

Respondents

Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents according to title and function. The list is arranged in order according to frequency of response. More than 50 different titles were mentioned and coded into these five categories. Administrators in academic affairs--vice presidents, vice chancellors, deans, and assistants--represent the largest set of respondents; almost one-third of the questionnaires were completed by persons in these positions.

The second most numerous group of respondents is administrators in Institutional Research, followed by an "Other" category which includes administrative level but not functional designation. This category also includes the three respondents who are coordinators of student retention. Persons in developmental student services and academic advising each make up 10 percent of the sample of respondents. Student services or student affairs administrators represent 8 percent of the respondents, and deans of students another 5 percent, with enrollment administrators and administrative or executive assistants each representing 3 percent.

Enrollment and Attrition

Respondents were asked to indicate the average percentage of full-time entering freshmen not enrolled one year later. Those responses are presented in Table 2. The mode, i.e. the most frequent response, is a 26-30 percent attrition rate for the freshman class. Only about one-fourth of the respondents indicated that their institutions expect to lose one-quarter or less of the freshman class. Almost two-thirds of the respondents expect freshman attrition rates to average 26-50 percent; and 12 of the institutions average losing at least half of their full-time entering freshmen. As seen in Table 3, the expected freshmen attrition rates are fairly soundly based on actual numbers and not merely estimates: only 20 percent of the responses are estimates.

Table 4 presents full-time freshman enrollment data for 1980-1984. These descriptive statistics provide interesting information about responding institutions. The size of the smallest freshman class has decreased over this time, and the size of the largest class has increased. While the overall range in freshman class sizes has widened, the standard deviation has decreased. This

means, of course, that freshman enrollments are becoming slightly more uniform at these institutions. This observation is further supported by the fact that the mean and median (the average and midpoint) become closer in value over the period. The increase in skewness and kurtosis of the distribution further reflects the fact that the distribution is more and more heavily populated by more similar institutions so those with larger full-time freshman enrollments are relatively more extreme.

Table 5 presents the same descriptive statistics for the distribution of institutions reporting the percentage of full-time freshmen enrolled one year later. Here we see an increase from 1981 to 1982 to 1983 in the minimum percentage of full-time freshmen being retained for one year. The trend reverses in 1983, however, and reaches the lowest minimum one-year freshman retention rate. With the exception of a drop in 1981, the maximum retention percentage remains stable.

In this distribution, several factors point to the fact that responding institutions tend toward higher one-year retention rates for their full-time freshmen. The mean is lower than the median in each of the four years, and this indicates that the distribution is negatively skewed, i.e., more cases fall on the higher retention end of the distribution.

In 1980, about two-thirds of the responding institutions had a one-year retention rate ranging from 49.5 percent to 89.1 percent of their full-time freshman class. By 1983, that had changed only slightly to a range of 48.4 to 89.2 percent. The upper end of the expected range exceeds the actual maximums of the distributions. . This results from the skewness--lack of symmetry--in the distribution. Again, the evidence points to higher rates of freshman retention among responding institutions than would be expected for a normal distribution. These retention rates are lower than the 69 percent averages reported by public, bachelor's degree-granting institutions responding to ACT's Institutional Data Questionnaire in 1986, and lower than the rates (66-68%) reported for four-year institutions in the 1979 survey.

Table 6 reports two-year full-time freshman retention data. The "worst-off" institution(s) improved their two-year retention rate by 1 percent from 1980 to 1981, dropped back to 16 percent in 1982, and dropped again in 1983 to only 15 percent. On the successful end, there is considerably greater fluctuation in the two-year retention rates. During this period, the most successful institution(s) started and ended with an 81 percent rate of retention from the freshman to junior year. In between these years, the best rate plunged 4 points to 77 percent and then soared up to an astounding 98 percent rate.

The mean two-year retention rate, however, is just over one-half of the initial freshman class for each of these four years. This average is one or two percentage points lower than that reported in the 1979 survey. These distributions are fairly symmetrical: 95 percent of the institutions reporting this information for 1980 could expect two-year retention rates from 25.5 to 80.7 percent, and the comparable range expected for 1983 is from 27.2 percent to 78.4 percent.

In Table 7, data for total full-time enrollments are reported. There is, indeed, a very wide range in enrollment size among the AASCU institutions, and respondents to the survey include both the largest and smallest institutions in the association. Enrollments over this period have increased, on average. These descriptive statistics indicate that the bulk of members have enrollments on the lower end of the range, but it is also the case that both the range and the variability within have increased. In 1981, about two-thirds of the institutions should have enrollments between 1,592 and 9,144. By 1983, that expected range had increased to between 1,001 and 9,963.

These enrollment data are categorized in increments of 2,500 in Table 8. This further demonstrates the fact that the sample is clustered on the lower end of the enrollment range. For each of the four years reported here, three-quarters of the institutions have enrollments of less than 7,500. Recall that the average enrollment is within the 5,000-7,499 interval.

Full-time enrollment data provided by AASCU for the total membership in 1984 show that the responding institutions are not representative with respect to enrollments. For example, 55 percent of the membership have enrollments of 6,000 and under compared to 71 percent of the respondents. Since the data in Table 8 do not disclose the enrollment distribution at the upper end, the 1983 data are recategorized for direct comparison with data reported by AASCU. Those data appear in Table 8-A.

Tables 9 and 10 report percentage enrollments classified as full-time and part-time. Given the fact that 65 percent of the total membership's enrollments are full-time and 35 percent are part-time, it is again the case that responding institutions represent a bias toward higher rates of full-time enrollments.

Finally, Table 11 reports the percentage using actual enrollment data and estimates. Institutions providing enrollment data have, in almost all cases (88 percent), provided actual data.

Table 1
Titles of Respondents

Title	Percentage	n
Academic Affairs: Vice President, Vice Chancellor, Dean, Assistant Vice President, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Assistant Dean	31%	36
Institutional Research: Director, Assistant, Specialist	16	18
Other, Unspecified: Vice President, Vice Chancellor, Dean, Assistant Vice President, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Director, Coordinator	14	16
Developmental Student Services: Vice President, Vice Chancellor, Dean, Assistant Vice President, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Director	10	12
Academic Adivising: Director, Coordinator	10	11
Student Affairs/Services: Vice President, Vice Chancellor, Assistant Vice President, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Other Administrative Officer	8	9
Dean/Assistant Dean of Students	5	6
Admissions/Enrollment Services: Vice President, Vice Chancellor, Assistant Vice President, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Dean	3	4
Administrative/Executive Assistant	3	4

Table 2

Percentage of Full-time Entering Freshmen Not Enrolled One Year Later, On Average

	Total %	Valid %
0- 5%	0.5%	0.6%
6-10	0.0	0.0
11-15	5.5	6.1
16-20	5.5	6.1
21-25	12.6	13.9
26-30	18.0	20.0
31-35	12.0	13.3
36-40	13.1	14.5
41-45	11.5	12.7
46-50	4.9	5.5
51-55	3.8	4.2
56-60	0.0	0.0
61-65	1.6	1.8
66-70	0.5	0.6
71-75	0.0	0.0
76% or more	0.5	0.6
No Response	9.8	

Table 3

Actual or Estimated Figures Used in Table 2

	Total %	Valid %
Actual	69.9%	80.0%
Estimated	17.5	20.0
No Response	12.6	

Table 4

Number of New Freshmen (Full-Time Only)
Enrolled 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Minimum Number	132	123	98	113
Maximum Number	4167	4201	4183	4213
Mean Number	1245	1179	1140	1159
Median	1102	1041	1009	1056
Standard Deviation About the Mean	776	747	726	737
Skewness	1.31	1.28	1.39	1.42
Kurtosis	2.27	2.29	2.80	2.92
Valid Cases	100	113	119	122

Table 5

Percentage of New Full-Time Freshmen Enrolled One Year Later: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Minimum Percentage	13%	14%	15%	12%
Maximum Percentage	89%	85%	90%	89%
Mean Percentage	64.3%	64.1%	64.5%	63.8%
Median	65.5%	66.0%	66.0%	66.0%
Standard Deviation About the Mean	14.8	15.1	14.6	15.4
Skewness	-1.02	-1.13	-1.21	-1.22
Kurtosis	1.93	1.54	2.13	2.07
Valid Cases	84	90	103	105

Table 6

Percentage of New Full-Time Freshmen Enrolled Two Years Later: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Minimum Percentage	16%	17%	16%	15%
Maximum Percentage	81%	77%	98%	81%
Mean Percentage	53.1%	53.8%	54.2%	52.8%
Median	52.0%	53.5%	54.0%	54.0%
Standard Deviation About the Mean	13.8	12.6	12.9	12.8
Skewness	-0.14	-0.49	-0.03	-0.52
Kurtosis	0.14	0.50	1.71	0.65
Valid Cases	74	76	81	80

Table 7

Total Number of Full-Time Students: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Minimum Number	428	471	314	423
Maximum Number	16618	16508	21335	32194
Mean Number	5368	5235	5363	5482
Median	4548	4595	4603	4790
Standard Deviation About the Mean	3776	3744	4022	4481
Skewness	1.29	1.27	1.47	2.48
Kurtosis	1.32	1.32	2.43	10.49
Valid Cases	100	107	112	116

Table 8

Percentage Distribution of Total Full-Time Enrollment of Institutions: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Less than 2500	23%	24%	24%	24%
2500 - 4999	36	36	35	31
5000 - 7999	20	20	20	23
7500 or more	21	21	21	22
Valid Cases	100	107	112	116

Table 8-A

Full-Time Enrollment:
Total Membership vs. Respondents

	1983 Respondents	1984 Membership
0 - 3,000	30%	27%
3,000 - 6,000	41	28
6,000 - 9,000	14	17
9,000 - 12,000	8	13
12,000 - 15,000	4	5
15,000 - 18,000	3	5
18,000 - 21,000	0	2
21,000 24,000	0	2
24,000 - 37,000	1	2
	total cases = 116	total institutions = 362

Table 9

Percentage of Total Enrollment that is Full-Time: 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Minimum Percentage	32%	25%	6%	3%
Maximum Percentage	98%	98%	97%	97%
Mean Percentage	75.6%	73.5%	73.0%	72.2%
Median	79%	76%	78%	76%
Standard Deviation About the Mean	13.89	16.51	17.51	18.20
Skewness	-0.55	-.073	-1.01	-1.11
Kurtosis	-0.23	-0.03	1.22	1.52
Valid Cases	99	104	109	113

Table 10

Percentage of Total Enrollment that is Part-Time:
1980, 1981, 1982, 1983

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Minimum Percentage	2%	1%	1%	1%
Maximum Percentage	68%	75%	75%	73%
Mean Percentage	24.5%	26.1%	25.8%	25.7%
Median	21.5%	22.5%	21.5%	20.5%
Standard Deviation About the Mean	14.0	16.4	16.7	16.4
Skewness	0.54	0.70	0.68	0.68
Kurtosis	-0.25	0.03	-0.10	-0.20
Valid Cases	98	104	110	116

Table 11

Enrollment Data are Actual Figures
or Estimates

	Total %	Valid %
Actual Data	63.4	87.9
Estimates	8.7	12.1
No Response	27.9	

Campus Studies and Analyses of Retention and Attrition

Analysis on Campus

Over two-thirds of the institutions responding to the survey report that they have already conducted one or more studies of attrition or retention on their campuses. (See Table 12.) This is about the same percentage of completed studies as found at four-year institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey of retention.

About 28 percent of the AASCU institutions report that they are currently conducting such a study, and 20 percent have plans to do so. About 12 percent of the respondents perceive a need for a retention study, although no plans have yet been made to conduct such a study at their institutions.

While only 2 percent of the 1979 national sample responded that no study had been conducted and no need for a study was perceived, no respondents in the current survey hold that attitude about the importance of retention or attrition analyses. All of the AASCU institutions participating in this survey recognized a need to study retention, and most had already implemented a plan to respond to that need.

As seen in Table 13, about 70 percent of the respondents are at institutions where a survey was a part, at least, of the analytical study of retention/attrition. By far the most likely group to be surveyed at these institutions are students who are currently enrolled. Eighty-five percent of the surveys were of currently enrolled students, and that group is followed in survey popularity (75 percent) by students who are no longer enrolled and never graduated. Institutions responding to this survey are about equally likely to survey prospective students and alumni: 33 percent and 35 percent, respectively. Nearly a quarter of the institutions using surveys target re-enrolling students for their studies. Non-students--faculty, staff, and administrators--are less frequently surveyed by institutions studying retention, but 16 percent of the respondents have surveyed faculty, 12 percent have surveyed administrators, and 9 percent staff members.

Only 34 respondents indicated that no survey had been conducted to study retention/attrition on campus. The reasons given by these respondents are reported in Table 14. Lack of time and lack of staff (44 percent) were the most frequently given reasons for not conducting a survey as part of the retention/attrition analysis. The dollar cost (too expensive) was a reason given by about one-quarter of the respondents. Fifteen percent of those who did no

survey doubted that a survey would provide helpful information. More technical problems were cited, as well: 12 percent could not find a suitable survey instrument, 6 percent said their local staff was unable to develop a suitable instrument, and 6 percent said that the perceived difficulty of scoring and analyzing the data prohibited doing a survey.

The Attrition Milieu

Respondents were asked to evaluate a list of 17 negative campus characteristics. The questionnaire explained that attrition, (defined on the survey) is linked to negative campus characteristics, and that the list contained the most commonly mentioned characteristics found to be linked to attrition. The rating was of importance from low, a value of 1, to high, a value of 5. Table 15 presents the mean scores for each of the 18 characteristics contributing to an attrition milieu.

The most important factor contributing to an attrition milieu is inadequate academic advising. The average rating by AASCU institutions for inadequate academic advising is 3.39--considerably higher than the 3.03 average rating that this factor scored in the 1979 national survey, but lower than the 3.58 rating given by four-year public institutions in that survey. This factor was the most important negative characteristic in the national survey, as well.

A "close second" in importance among the leading contributors to an attrition environment is conflicts between class schedules and job. The mean score for this item is 3.37. This factor is rated almost as important as inadequate academic advising.

Inadequate financial aid has the third highest average importance rating, 3.25. This is significantly higher than the average rating of 2.61 scored by the financial aid factor among four-year institutions in the 1979 national survey. The mean score for the importance of this factor ranks third for AASCU institutions, but it was only ninth for the comparable institutions in the 1979 survey.

In addition to the three most important factors there are five others having a mean rating that places them toward the high importance end of the scale. These are, in order of importance, inadequate counseling support system (2.78); inadequate personal contact between students and faculty (2.75); inadequate curricular offerings (2.68); inadequate part-time employment opportunities (2.62); and inadequate academic support services, learning centers, and similar resources (2.60).

Factors clearly rated as having low importance to campus attrition include lack of faculty care and concern for students (2.47)--right on the borderline; inadequate extracurricular services (2.44); inadequate opportunity for cultural and social growth (2.35); lack of staff care and concern for students (2.31);

unsatisfactory living accommodations (2.28); insufficient intellectual stimulation or challenge (2.15); and quality of teaching not consistently high (2.14). Items mentioned as "other" negative attributes are listed in Appendix B.

Respondents were asked to give the number (1-17) of the characteristic they consider to be most important. The three attributes having the highest mean rating have the highest frequency of response here. The order changed somewhat, however. Inadequate academic advising was chosen by 25 respondents, inadequate financial aid by 24, and conflict between class schedule and job by 20 respondents.

Compared to the four-year public institutions responding in 1979, AASCU respondents place considerably more importance on the negative impact of financial factors. Conflict between class schedule and job has the second highest mean compared to fourth in the 1979 survey; inadequate financial aid has the third highest mean compared to ninth in 1979; and the mean for inadequate part-time employment ranks seventh compared to twelfth in 1979. On a more positive note, the impact of a lack of care and concern for students by staff is perceived as far less important by AASCU institutions in 1986 than was the case for four-year public institutions responding in 1979. The perceived importance of this negative attribute ranks twelfth of 17 now compared to fourth of 17 in 1979.

The Retention Milieu

Respondents were next asked to evaluate ten factors that are positive campus characteristics and, therefore, linked to retention. The mean importance ratings on these factors are reported in Table 16. Again, low importance is rated 1 and high importance is rated 5.

The factor perceived to be the most important contributor to a retention milieu on the campuses of the responding AASCU institutions is a caring attitude of faculty and staff. The mean here is 4.26, and 46 percent of those rating this item gave it a 5--the highest level of importance. This was also the item having the highest average importance in the national survey of 1979, but the 4.02 mean rating given by four-year public institutions was the lowest of any institutional type. In fact, respondents to the national survey and the AASCU survey rated the same five factors as the most important for retention. The order is very nearly the same.

Four of the five other attributes have a mean rating of 3 or higher. Of these 10 factors commonly associated with retention, only one has a mean importance rating below 3: a system for identifying potential dropouts (early alert system). The mean importance here was 2.91.

When asked to choose the single most important positive factor from these ten, a caring attitude of faculty and staff was mentioned by half of those responding. The second most frequently chosen positive characteristic was consistent high quality of teaching. This was the choice of 34 of the 137 respondents--about 25 percent. Twenty-one additional positive characteristics were mentioned in the "other" category. Many of these are very nearly the same as the coded responses above. But several factors are mentioned that have consistently been an important influence on students' college choice--location, cost, and reputation, for example. The list of other factors appears in Appendix C.

Student Dropout Potential

Moving now from institutional attributes to individual attributes, Table 17 reports the mean ratings for seven indicators of student dropout potential. Respondents were asked to evaluate each item according to its dropout potential from low, a value of 1, to high, a value of 5.

Academic attributes stand out as the leading indicators of dropout potential for students. Low academic achievement is rated as the best general indicator of dropout potential, followed by limited educational aspirations. Three-quarters of the respondents rating low academic achievement gave it a rating of 5, and the same percentage rated "limited aspirations" as 4 or 5.

Again, financial considerations were perceived to be important. The mean rating for inadequate financial resources as an indicator of dropout potential is 3.96. Further, students who are economically disadvantaged were on average perceived to have a rather high dropout potential--above the midpoint in the scale.

Students who have not decided on a major or who have no career plans are thought to have a high potential to drop out. Interestingly this "undecided" attribute received the third highest dropout rating in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey, and it surpassed the lack of financial means as a dropout-prone characteristic in that survey. Among AASCU respondents, the reverse order is found. This higher rating for financial factors is most likely a result of the economic situation of higher education in 1986 relative to that of 1979.

The two categories of students that are associated with "nontraditional" students--commuter and first generation college--have the lowest average dropout potential rating. About 60 percent of those responding chose low academic achievement as the most important indicator of dropout potential, and about one-third rated low educational aspiration as the second most important indicator.

Responses given in the "other" category are reported in Appendix D. Again, several of these could easily have fit into the seven factors above. "Living off campus" would fit the commuter category for example. A total of 90 responses are included among the 20 different dropout-prone characteristics mentioned.

Summary of Attrition and Retention Factors

The factors having the five highest mean ratings in the attrition milieu, retention milieu, and dropout potential categories are presented in Table 18. Some factors appear in all three categories, as one would expect. With the exception of financial aid (adequate amounts) the other factors are fairly qualitative dimensions of educational service provision. These other factors require a campus-wide commitment to student success.

Table 12

Campus Studies and Analyses of Retention and Attrition

	% Affirmative	
Have Conducted One or More Studies of Attrition and Retention	69.4%	(67%)*
Are Now Conducting Such a Study	27.9	(42)
Planning to Conduct a Study	20.2	(21)
See Need for Study, but No Plans Yet	11.5	(15)
See No Need for Study	0.0	(3)

*Numbers in parentheses are percentages of the 221 responding four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey.

Table 13

Groups Surveyed in Analysis of Retention

	% Affirmative
Groups Surveyed	69.4%
Prospective Students	33
Current Students	85
Former Students, Non-graduates	75
Re-enrollers (Stopouts who have returned)	24
Alumni	35
Faculty	16
Administrators	12
Staff	9
Others	12

Table 14

Reason for Which No Survey was Included in Analysis of Retention

	% Affirmative*
Did not think would provide helpful information	15%
Could not locate suitable instruments	12
Too expensive	24
Available instruments not flexible enough	6
Insufficient time to prepare and administer the survey	44
Staff unavailable to prepare and administer the survey	44
Local staff unable to develop suitable instrument	6
Difficulties associated with scoring and analyzing data	6
Other	29

*34 responded that no survey has been conducted.
% reported here are of those 34 responses.

Table 15

Average Ratings of Importance of Negative Campus Characteristics

Scale: 1 (Low Importance) — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5 (High Importance)

	Mean	n
Inadequate academic advising (1)*	3.39	155
Conflict between class schedule and job (4)	3.37	161
Inadequate financial aid (9)	3.25	156
Inadequate counseling support system (7)	2.78	154
Inadequate personal contact between students and faculty (2)	2.75	156
Inadequate curricular offerings (3)	2.68	158
Inadequate part-time employment (12)	2.62	156
Inadequate academic support services, learning centers, and similar resources (6)	2.60	156
Lack of faculty care and concern (11)	2.47	154
Inadequate extracurricular services (15)	2.44	156
Inadequate opportunity for cultural and social growth (10)	2.35	154
Lack of staff care and concern for students (4)	2.31	153
Unsatisfactory living accommodations (16)	2.28	152
Inadequate career planning services (8)	2.21	154
Insufficient intellectual stimulation or challenge (14)	2.15	156
Quality of teaching not consistently high (13)	2.14	153
Restrictive rules and regulations governing student behavior (17)	1.40	157

*Numbers in parentheses show rank order of the mean for four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey. AASCU responses are listed in order of decreasing magnitude of the mean.

Table 16

Average Ratings of Importance of Positive Campus Characteristics

Scale: 1——2——3——4——5
1 = Low Importance; 5 = High Importance

	Mean	n
Caring attitude of faculty and staff (1)*	4.26	159
Consistent high quality of teaching (3)	4.06	159
Adequate financial aid programs (2)	3.47	159
Consistent high quality of advising (5)	3.46	156
Encouragement of student involvement in campus life (4)	3.41	157
Excellent career planning services (6)	3.20	159
Admissions practices geared to recruiting students likely to persist to graduation (8)	3.16	158
Overall concern for student-institutional congruence or "fit" (9)	3.13	156
Excellent counseling services (7)	3.11	158
System of identifying potential dropouts (early alert system) (10)	2.91	157

*Numbers in parentheses show rank order of the mean for four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey. AASCU responses are listed in order of decreasing magnitude of the mean.

Table 17

Mean Rating of Student Characteristics Relative to Dropout Potential

Scale: 1——2——3——4——5
1 = Low Importance; 5 = High Importance

	Mean	n
Low academic achievement (1)*	4.69	166
Limited educational aspirations (2)	4.12	162
Inadequate financial resources (4)	3.96	165
Indecision about major or career (3)	3.75	165
Economically disadvantaged (5)	3.48	164
First generation to college (6)	2.86	161
Commuter (7)	2.67	164

*Numbers in parentheses show rank order of the mean for four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey. AASCU responses are listed in order of decreasing magnitude of the mean.

Table 18

Most Important Factors in Student Retention: Rank Order of Mean Ratings*

Campus/Student Characteristics	Mean
Negative	
Inadequate academic advising (1)[1]	3.39
Conflict between class schedule and job (4)	3.37
Inadequate financial aid (9)	3.25
Inadequate counseling support system (7)	2.78
Inadequate personal contact between students and faculty (2)	2.75
Positive	
Caring attitude of faculty and staff (1)	4.26
Consistent high quality of teaching (3)	4.06
Adequate financial aid programs (2)	3.47
Consistent high quality of academic advising (5)	3.46
Encouragement of student involvement in campus life (4)	3.41
Drop-Out Potential	
Low academic achievement (1)	4.69
Limited educational aspirations (2)	4.12
Inadequate financial resources (3)	3.96
Indecision about major or career (4)	3.75
Economically disadvantaged (5)	3.48

*Only the five highest means are reported for each set of characteristics.

[1]Numbers in parentheses show rank order of the mean for four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey.

Campus Organization for Retention

Retention Coordination

The next part of the survey turns to how the campus is organized for retention. Among AASCU institutions that have appointed someone to coordinate retention activities on campus, the dominant pattern is to assign this responsibility to an existing staff position. (See Table 19.) Very few institutions--only 11--have created a new position to handle this responsibility.

While more than half of these respondents report that no one on their campus has this responsibility, that is a relatively large reduction over the 67 percent rate reported for four-year public institutions in the 1979 national survey.

As seen in Table 20, almost half of the institutions with a coordinator of retention have that coordinator reporting to the academic vice president or provost. The president heads the reporting line for just over one-quarter of those coordinators. Ten percent of the coordinators report to others, such as a dean (see Appendix F for the list), and 7 percent report to the vice-president for student affairs. Results from AASCU institutions reveal considerably more conformity in the choice of reporting lines than was the case for institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey. In none of the AASCU institutions responding does the coordinator of retention report to the registrar, director of institutional research, director of admissions, and so forth. These institutions have instead placed final authority in the hands of the top administrators on campus.

Steering Committees

A majority of these respondents are at institutions that have or have had a retention steering committee. (See Table 21.) Only about one-third of the institutions in the 1979 survey had a retention committee.

The make-up of these committees is presented in Table 22. Faculty members are most often included on retention steering committees, and they have the highest average number of members on these committees. The range of faculty membership is from 0 to 14, but fully 60 percent of the institutions with retention steering committees have just one member from the faculty on the committee.

Administrative personnel in student affairs are represented on 86 percent of the committees, and administrators in academic affairs are represented on 81 percent of the committees. Average representation in membership is about equal for the two.

Only half of the institutions having steering committees include students on these committees. Forty-two percent of the steering committees have only one student representative, 8.4 percent have from 2 to 6 student representatives, and the remaining 50 percent have no student members.

Very few institutions extend membership on the retention committee to staff in support services. Only 26 percent of the committees have from 1 to 3 persons from support services--including library personnel, secretarial/support staff in the admissions office, registrar's office, counseling office, advising office, and other service areas.

While retention steering committees are far more popular among AASCU institutions now than was the case for four-year public institution in the 1979 survey, it appears that the size of these committees is considerably smaller.

Initial Moving Force

When asked to identify the initial moving force behind their campus's retention efforts, the respondents most frequently identified the president. As reported in Table 23, 56 percent of the institutions in the survey had a president serving in the role of retention program innovator, pushing for adoption of a plan.

The vice president of academic affairs was identified as the initial moving force for retention at 52 percent of the campuses responding to the survey, and the student affairs vice president was named by 44 percent of the respondents.

Again the AASCU institutions responding to this survey reveal considerably stronger concentration at top administrative levels than was the case for the four-year public institutions responding to the 1979 national sample. Additional mentions are reported in Appendix G.

Problems Encountered

Table 24 reports the problems encountered by retention efforts. The most frequently mentioned problem is lack of staff (56 percent) followed by insufficient data (54 percent). Lack of funds was mentioned by 50 percent of the respondents, and lack of time by 49 percent. After that, the frequency of mention drops rather drastically. The relative frequency with which these problems are encountered appears very much the same for AASCU institutions now as reported by four-year public institutions in 1979.

Additional problems encountered by retention efforts are listed in Appendix H, and the "unique" conditions that were identified by respondents as either positive or negative impacts on retention are reported in Appendix J.

Table 19

Coordinator of Retention Activities

	% Total	% with Coordinator*
One existing staff assigned	29% (17%)[1]	65%
Existing staff from several areas assigned	15 (11)	33
New position created	6 (4)	14
No one assigned to coordinate overall retention activities	56 (67)	

*This percentage is actually calculated using the number of respondents who did not check the "No one assigned" response (81 or 44%). Percentages do not sum to 100% because of multiple responses.

[1]Numbers in parentheses are percentages from 221 four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey.

Table 20

Reporting Line of Retention Coordinator (only for institutions having coordinator)

Title to Whom Coordinator Reports	% Total	% with Coordinator*
President	12%	27% (24)[1]
Academic Vice President (Provost)	21	48 (35)
Student Affairs Vice President	3	7 (21)
Registrar	0	0 (2)
Director of Institutional Research	0	0 (3)
Director of Counseling	0	0 (2)
Director of Admissions	0	0 (0)
Other - specify	4	10 (14)

*This percentage is actually calculated using the number of respondents who did not check "No one assigned." Percentages do not sum to 100% because of non-responses.

[1]Numbers in parentheses are percentages for 63 four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey that had a retention coordinator.

Table 21

Institution Has (Had) Retention Steering Committee

	% of total	% valid
% yes	51.9%	54.1%
% no	42.6	45.1
no response	5.5	

Table 22

Number Having Served on Retention Steering Committee by Position of Members

	Average # on Committee	% Committees* Having this Member
Faculty	1.9 (3.1)[1]	91.6%
Students	0.7 (2.0)	50.5
Administration -		
General	0.9 (1.8)	62.1
Academic Affairs	1.2 (1.5)	81.1
Student Affairs	1.3 (1.9)	86.3
Support Service Staff (food service, library, housekeeping, secretarial staff, and so forth	0.3 (1.5)	26.3
Other - specify	0.1 (1.5)	8.4

*Percentage is of institutions having had a retention steering committee, 95 in all.

[1]Numbers in parentheses are the average number of members of each group reported by 73 four-year public institutions having a retention steering committee in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey.

Table 23

Initial Moving Force Behind Insitution's Retention Effort

	% Affirmative
Board of Trustees	8.2% (4%)*
President	56.3 (40)
Vice President for Business Affairs	3.3 (2)
Vice President for Academic Affairs	51.9 (35)
Vice President for Student Affairs	43.7 (32)
Faculty	12.0 (14)
Admission	19.0 (26)
Registrar	8.7 (16)
Academic department	6.0 (16)
Counseling services	14.8 (25)
Alumni	0.5 (0)
Financial aid	2.2 (4)
Career planning and placement	4.9 (4)
Federal statistics or reporting requirements	6.6 (6)
Other student services	7.1 (13)
External stimulus	6.0 (3)
Other	9.8 (22)

*Numbers in parentheses show percentages for 221 four-year public institutions in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey.

Table 24

Problems Encountered by Retention Effort (By Frequency of Response)

	% Affirmative	Mentions As Most Important*
Lack of staff (2)[1]	55.7%	47
Insufficient data (1)	53.6	50
Lack of funds (4)	49.7	43
Lack of time (3)	49.2	28
Inadequate data - processing capabilities (6)	29.0	23
Lack of support from faculty (6)	26.2	22
Inadequate measurement instruments (8)	22.4	10
Actual resistance to acceptance of new roles or responsibilities (6)	20.2	14
Actual resistance to policy changes (11)	19.7	14
Inadequate measurement expertise (9)	16.4	2
Lack of support from administrators (10)	9.3	8

*Number of respondents identifying this as one of the five most important problems encountered.

[1]Numbers in parentheses show the rank in frequency of mentions for the 221 four-year public institution in the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey. AASCU responses are reported in order of decreasing frequencies.

Action Programs Since 1980

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate specific attempts on campus--aside from analytical studies of attrition and retention--to provide new or modified action programs aimed at improving retention. The survey instructions stressed that only "activities that have been restructured or introduced in a specific effort to improve retention" were to be noted. Twenty-two program or service areas were listed, and some of these had several specific programs listed within them. The results are presented in Table 25.

Only 4 percent of the institutions reported that no special program had been undertaken to improve retention. That compares quite favorably to the 13% reported by four-year public institutions in 1979. Quite clearly, retention efforts are widespread and highly utilized among these institutions. With very few exceptions, the percentage of AASCU institutions involved in these retention activities since 1980 far exceeds that for four-year public institutions surveyed just prior to that period.

Changes in academic advising programs are the most frequently mentioned retention activities. This is followed very closely, however, by special orientation programs: 72 percent and 71 percent, respectively.

Responses to the more specific type of activity included under the broader activity category--special orientation programs, for example--reveal that some institutions are using more than one type of orientation, advising, or curricular innovation strategy, to mention only a few areas.

Third in frequency of use is establishment of early warning systems or intervention strategies aimed at reducing attrition. Almost two-thirds of the respondents have made changes in existing programs or have implemented new programs during the 1980's that are targeted toward dropout prone students. Again, it is evident that institutions use multiple strategies to achieve better retention rates among this set of students.

Almost equally popular retention efforts are curricular innovations in credit-bearing offerings. Included here are freshman orientation courses, study skills courses, career choice and planning courses, and the like.

Although curricular innovations in the noncredit course area are considerably less popular, 45 percent of the institutions report utilizing this strategy. Among the more frequently mentioned noncredit programs are study skills courses and tutorial programs.

Formal remedial courses aimed specifically at retention are now offered at more than half (56 percent) of the institutions in the survey. This reflects a national trend in that remedial/developmental programs are being established in colleges and universities at a rate faster than any other type of program.

Another program that is being used in over half of the institutions in this survey is student peer advising and counseling. About 53 percent of the respondents report that peer advising is used on their campuses. That is quite a jump over the use rates--34 percent for four-year public institutions--reported in the national survey of 1979.

A look at the least popular retention-related programs shows that very few institutions are creating new administrative structures as part of their effort to improve retention. Further, placement services and job training programs are receiving very little attention, at least insofar as they relate to the retention efforts of these institutions.

Finally, the results here indicate the same reluctance to formally reward quality advising as is found in the most recent ACT National Survey of Academic Advising conducted in 1986 (Crockett, Habley, and Cowart: 1987). Despite the fact that inadequate academic advising is considered one of the most significant factors associated with attrition and quality academic advising one of the most significant factors associated with retention, only 16 percent of these institutions formally include advising effectiveness in faculty promotions and tenure decisions. There may, of course, be some institutions in this survey that do formally evaluate advising effectiveness in promotion or tenure decisions but who do not consider this to be a part of their retention efforts. The assumption is, however, that the number of such institutions is small.

A list of other programs designed to improve retention is in Appendix K. Eighteen percent of the respondents indicated that there are additional programs at their institutions.

Table 25

Activities to Improve Retention Since 1980

	% Affirmative
No special action program	4.4 (13)*
Special orientation program	71.0
-- Expanded or continuing type orientation program	47.5
-- Parent's program	33.9
Improvement/redevelopment of academic advising program	72.1 (56)
-- Academic Advising Centers that combine advisement counseling with career planning and placement	14.2
-- Training academic advisors	37.2
-- Advisory manuals	34.4
Curriculum innovations in credit programs	61.7 (31)
-- Freshman seminar/orientation courses for credit	33.3
-- Career planning course	18.6
-- Study skills course	30.1
-- Library orientation courses/programs	19.7
-- Enhancement laboratories	13.1
-- Tutoring programs	25.1
New noncredit course offerings	45.4 (17)
-- Freshman orientation courses	13.1
-- Career planning courses	18.0
-- Study skills courses	32.2
-- Library orientation course/program	15.8
-- Enhancement laboratories	13.1
-- Tutoring programs	32.2
Establishment of early warning systems for identifying and communicating with potential dropouts or stopouts	65.6 (26)
-- Tutorial services referrals	32.8
-- Intra semester grade reports	25.7
-- Placement testing on entering students	39.9
Special counseling programs	32.8 (43)
New administrative structures	8.7 (20)
-- Freshman centers	2.7
-- Freshman/sophomore centers	0.5
New or revitalized extracurricular activities	29.0 (16)

Table 25
(continued)

	% Affirmative
Expanded academic support/enrichment/learning services	41.0 (39)
Formal remedial courses	55.7 (NA)
Special or required services for students who have not declared a major	29.5 (31)
Expanded placement services	16.9 (24)
Job-related training programs	15.8 (14)
Faculty/instructional development programs	33.3 (15)
Formal inclusion of advising effectiveness in faculty promotion and tenure decisions	15.8 (10)
Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student-institution "fit"	27.3 (17)
Exit interview conducted	35.0 (36)
Use of students as peer advisers and counselors	52.5 (34)
Involvement of students in administration, curricular design, other traditionally "non-student" activities	20.2 (17)
Special and significant services designed to retain:	
-- Adult learners	25.1 (17)
-- Commuting students	13.7 (NA)
-- Minority students	36.6 (NA)
Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student retention	20.8 (NA)
Other	18.0

*Numbers in parentheses are percentages for 221 four-year public institutions responding to the 1979 ACT-NCHEMS survey. Items not included on that survey are noted "not available" (NA). Some were included on the survey, but omitted in the report (Beal and Noel: 1980).

Analyzing the Impact of Freshman Attrition Rates

In Table 26, the responses are presented according to the average percentage of freshmen not enrolled one year later, i.e. the average freshman attrition rates reported by the respondents. A total of 165 institutions is represented in this response, and the attrition rates are categorized as follows:

	n	percent
Low (0-25 percent attrition)	44	26.7
Moderate (26-35 percent attrition)	55	33.3
High (36-50 percent attrition)	54	32.7
Excessive (51 percent or more attrition)	12	7.3
total	165	

The purpose here is not to provide a detailed re-analysis of the data, but rather to determine whether there seems to be a systematic difference in attitude and behavior at institutions having different expectations about the rate of attrition in their freshman classes. Institutions that anticipate a loss of not more than one-fourth of their freshman class are, quite reasonably, expected to pursue different activities than institutions that regularly expect to loose more than half of their freshmen.

Analysis on Campus

While only about 70 percent of the total respondents reported that an analysis of retention had been done on their campus, over 90 percent of those responding to both this item and the average freshman attrition question report that at least one study has been done. Institutions having the lowest freshman attrition rates are those least likely to have conducted a study, but one would hardly say that these are "unlikely" to do so since 91 percent report that they have conducted one or more studies. Institutions that on average lose more than half of the freshman class are the most likely to see the need for a study but have no plans for one (17 percent).

With respect to whether students were surveyed, there is remarkable uniformity across the different freshman attrition rates. Institutions with the lowest rates are, however, slightly more likely to have conducted a survey.

Looking at the specific groups surveyed, only the highest attrition category stands out. These institutions survey current students, but that is about the extent of their efforts. Only one institution seems to have covered all of the groups mentioned in the survey.

The Attrition Milieu

The average ratings given on the importance of the 17 negative campus characteristics reveal a very interesting finding. With few--and then only minor--exceptions, the institutions included in this analysis gave lower ratings than was the case for the entire sample of respondents. The really interesting finding here, however, is that institutions having "excessive" freshman attrition rates give these attrition-related factors the highest importance ratings on 15 of the 17 factors, and the differences are quite large.

The Retention Milieu

No such clear pattern emerges when positive attributes of the campus are evaluated for their importance in retaining students. The role of the faculty again stands out as having the highest importance ratings. Both a caring attitude and high quality of instruction are given high scores. While the score is high, it is the case, however, that the institutions having the highest freshman attrition rates attach the least importance to the positive influence that a caring attitude of faculty and staff has on their campus.

Four factors from the list of ten stand out for the highest attrition institutions. The mean rating on these factors is lower for the highest attrition institutions than for any other group. While the factors are generally thought to have a positive influence, it is perhaps felt that the impact is weak on these campuses. In any case, the highest attrition institutions have the lowest ratings on caring attitude of faculty and staff, consistent high quality of academic advising, admissions practices geared to recruiting students likely to persist to graduation, and a system for identifying potential dropouts. The score on the latter two items (2.37) is the lowest score for any item from any of the attrition categories.

On the other hand, these high attrition institutions gave the highest rating of any group to the positive influence on their campuses of encouraging student involvement in campus life. Further, the institutions in the two highest attrition groupings perceive that their financial aid programs and career planning programs are making an important positive contribution, and the ratings given by these respondents are higher than for institutions in the lower attrition groupings.

Dropout Indicators

Institutions that tend to lose more than half of their freshman class give the highest dropout potential ratings to three of the seven indicators: low academic achievement, limited educational aspirations, and first generation college students. Indeed, on a five-point scale, the mean rating given by these institutions for low academic achievement as an indicator of dropout potential is 4.92. There is little disagreement among these institutions about the significance of this factor.

The rate of attrition among freshmen does not serve to distinguish evaluations of the influence of indecision about majors and careers on dropout potential. The averages are almost identical for all four groups.

Campus Organization for Retention

The striking finding here is that institutions at opposite ends of freshmen attrition rates tend to look more like one another than like institutions with more similar attrition rates. Institutions that have the lowest freshman attrition rates are most likely to have assigned someone as coordinator of retention, and that assignment is most likely to have been made to one existing staff member and/or to a new position. These institutions are also the most likely to have retention steering committees.

With one exception, institutions having a freshman attrition rate in excess of 50 percent follow second in frequency rates on the campus organization for retention items. The exception is that the institutions having the highest freshman attrition rates are those most likely to have appointed staff from several areas to coordinate their retention efforts.

These institutions with high freshman attrition are markedly different from others in terms of the administrative position named to head the campus retention organization. While the academic vice president is the most typical position to which retention coordinators report, in those institutions with excessively high freshman attrition rates, the coordinator reports to the president.

Freshman attrition rates appear to be unrelated to the nature of the initial moving forces for retention. It is interesting to note, however, that no institution in the highest freshman attrition category reported that a member of the faculty served as an initial moving force for the campus retention effort.

Problems Encountered

The institutions with the highest freshman attrition reported the lowest rate for each of the problems most frequently encountered by the institutions in the

survey. Lack of appropriate data is the problem most frequently encountered by these high attrition institutions; but, unlike the others in the survey, few of these institutions (33 percent) reported that lack of staff or lack of time was a problem.

One might assume that the high attrition institutions experienced fewer problems simply because they made little effort to improve retention. That does not appear to be entirely the case, however, because no institution in the highest attrition category reported that they had pursued no special programs aimed specifically at increasing retention.

Specific Retention Activities

The two areas having the most involvement among the highest freshman attrition category are special orientation programs and formal remedial courses. Other areas in which their reported activity rates exceed those for institutions in other attrition levels include the following:

- curricular innovations in credit programs
- expanded academic support/enrichment/learning services
- expanded placement services
- use of students in peer advising and counseling
- involvement of students in traditionally "non-student" activities.

The institutions that are most successful in freshman retention report the highest activity rate in 10 of the 24 program areas and the lowest rate in 3. There are 9 program areas for which the highest freshman **retention** institutions are on opposite ends, in terms of activity rates, from the highest freshman **attrition** institutions. With one exception, the activity rates for high freshman retention institutions exceed those for high attrition institutions.

Finally, it might be worth noting that the two areas in which institutions averaging more than 50 percent attrition of their freshman classes diverge most sharply from the overall activity rates are admission-related retention efforts. Twenty-nine percent of the responding institutions have special admissions procedures designed to improve student-institutional "fit," but only 8.3 percent of the highest attrition institutions have adopted such strategies. Twenty-two percent of the responding institutions have implemented special admissions procedures and developed special admissions materials to improve retention, but no institutions in the highest freshman attrition group had used this strategy.

Table 26

AVERAGE FRESHMAN-TO-SOPHOMORE ATTRITION RATES
(average % full-time entering freshmen not enrolled one year later)

		Attrition Rate				
Analysis On Campus:		**0-25%**	**26-35%**	**36-50%**	**51% +**	**Total**
-Have conducted 1 or more analytical studies of attrition and retention	% =	91.4%	100.0%	97.3%	100.0%	96.8%
	n* =	35	41	37	11	124
-Now conducting such a study	% =	31.8	23.6	27.8	25.0	27.3
	n =	44	55	54	12	165
-Planning to conduct a study	% =	18.2	23.6	29.6	0.0	22.4
	n =	44	55	54	12	165
-See need for a study, but no action	% =	13.6	9.1	13.0	16.7	12.1
	n =	44	55	54	12	165
-See no need for a study and no plans to do so	% =	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	n =	44	55	54	12	165
Study included survey of one or more groups:	% =	84.6	80.4	80.4	80.0	81.5
	n =	39	51	46	10	146
Perspective students		17.9%	29.4%	23.9%	20.0%	24.0%
Current students		69.2	64.7	65.2	90.0	67.8
Former students who did not graduate		56.4	60.8	67.4	40.0	60.3
Re-enrollers (stopouts who have re-enrolled)		12.8	17.6	26.1	10.0	18.5
Alumni		28.2	31.4	30.4	10.0	28.8
Faculty		12.8	11.8	13.0	10.0	12.3
Administrators		7.7	7.8	10.9	10.0	8.9
Staff		7.7	7.8	6.5	0.0	6.8
Others		15.4	7.8	8.7	10.0	10.3

Table 26
(continued)

Analysis On Campus (continued):		Attrition Rate 0-25%	26-35%	36-50%	51% +	Total
Negative Campus Characteristics:						
Lack of faculty care and concern for students	Av =	2.53	2.32	2.44	2.73	2.44
	n =	38	47	48	11	144
Lack of staff care and concern for students	Av =	2.34	2.15	2.33	2.55	2.29
	n =	38	47	48	11	144
Quality of teaching is not consistently high	Av =	2.08	2.02	2.08	2.55	2.10
	n =	38	46	48	11	143
Inadequate academic advising	Av =	3.32	3.31	3.42	3.73	3.38
	n =	38	48	48	11	145
Inadequate counseling support system	Av =	2.54	2.90	2.75	3.46	2.80
	n =	37	48	48	11	144
Inadequate academic support services, learning centers and similar resources	Av =	2.45	2.55	2.64	3.18	2.60
	n =	38	47	47	11	143
Inadequate financial aid	Av =	3.11	3.19	3.27	3.91	3.25
	n =	38	48	48	11	145
Inadequate part-time employment opportunities	Av =	2.47	2.60	2.85	2.82	2.67
	n =	38	48	48	11	145
Inadequate career planning services	Av =	1.84	2.24	2.23	3.27	2.21
	n =	38	46	48	11	143
Inadequate extracurricular programs	Av =	2.37	2.17	2.60	2.91	2.42
	n =	38	48	48	11	145
Inadequate curricular offerings	Av =	2.71	2.63	2.53	3.09	2.65
	n =	38	48	49	11	146
Restrictive rules and regulations governing student behavior	Av =	1.26	1.48	1.35	1.82	1.40
	n =	38	48	39	11	146
Unsatisfactory living accommodations	Av =	2.24	2.50	2.15	2.27	2.30
	n =	38	48	46	11	143

Table 26
(continued)

Analysis On Campus (continued):		Attrition Rate 0-25%	26-35%	36-50%	51% +	Total
Negative Characteristics (continued):						
Inadequate personal contact between students and faculty	Av =	2.87	2.69	2.64	3.18	2.76
	n =	38	49	47	11	145
Inadequate opportunity for cultural and social growth	Av =	2.34	2.43	2.25	2.82	2.38
	n =	38	47	48	11	144
Insufficient intellectual stimulation or challenge	Av =	2.21	2.23	2.00	2.36	2.16
	n =	38	48	48	11	145
Conflict between class schedule and job	Av =	2.61	3.22	3.80	3.91	3.31
	n =	38	50	50	11	149
Positive Campus Characteristics						
Caring attitude of faculty and staff	Av =	4.10	4.39	4.35	4.00	4.27
	n =	39	49	49	11	148
Consistent high quality of teaching	Av =	3.95	4.14	4.10	4.09	4.07
	n =	39	49	49	11	148
Consistent high quality of academic advising	Av =	3.44	3.47	3.49	3.18	3.45
	n =	39	47	49	11	146
Adequate financial aid programs	Av =	3.31	3.49	3.64	3.55	3.50
	n =	39	47	50	11	147
Admissions practices geared to recruiting students likely to persist to graduation	Av =	3.51	3.15	2.94	2.73	3.14
	n =	39	48	49	11	147
Overall concern for student-institutional congruence or "fit"	Av =	3.31	3.23	2.81	3.18	3.11
	n =	39	47	48	11	145
Excellent counseling services	Av =	3.21	3.23	3.06	3.09	3.16
	n =	38	48	49	11	146
Excellent career planning services	Av =	3.28	3.08	3.25	3.27	3.20
	n =	39	48	49	11	147
System identifying potential dropouts (early alert system)	Av =	3.00	2.83	2.98	2.73	2.92
	n =	39	47	49	11	146

Table 26
(continued)

Analysis On Campus (continued):		Attrition Rate 0-25%	26-35%	36-50%	51% +	Total
Positive Campus Characteristics (continued):						
Encouragement of student involvement in campus life	Av =	3.61	3.49	3.29	3.64	3.47
	n =	38	49	48	11	146
Potential Indicators of Drop-out Prone Students:						
Low Academic achievement	Av =	4.50	4.69	4.80	4.92	4.69
	n =	40	51	51	12	154
Limited educational aspirations	Av =	4.05	4.29	3.92	4.55	4.12
	n =	39	48	52	11	150
First-generation college	Av =	2.95	2.77	2.81	3.09	2.85
	n =	38	48	52	11	149
Commuter	Av =	2.88	2.82	2.39	2.64	2.68
	n =	40	51	51	11	153
Economically disadvantaged status	Av =	3.45	3.43	3.56	3.36	3.47
	n =	40	49	52	11	152
Indecision about major or career goal	Av =	3.73	3.78	3.73	3.73	3.75
	n =	41	49	52	11	153
Inadequate financial resources	Av =	3.73	3.94	4.15	4.09	3.97
	n =	41	49	52	11	153

Table 26
(continued)

Campus Organization for Retention:		Attrition Rate 0-25%	26-35%	36-50%	51% +	Total
Assignment of Retention Coordination Activities:	n =	44	55	54	12	165
No one assigned		47.7%	56.4%	61.1%	50.0%	55.2%
One existing staff assigned		38.6	29.1	27.8	33.3	31.5
Existing staff from several areas assigned		11.4	14.6	16.7	25.0	15.2
New position created for assignment		11.4	3.6	5.6	8.3	6.7
Campus has (had) retention steering committee		63.4%	54.5%	52.8%	58.3%	56.5%
	n =	41	55	53	12	161
Most Frequently Mentioned Title to Whom Retention Coordinator (if any) Reports	n =	23	24	21	6	74
President		21.7%	25.0%	33.3%	66.7%	29.7%
Academic Vice President/Provost		43.5	54.2	66.7	16.7	51.4
Student Affairs Vice President		8.7	8.3	9.5	0.0	8.1

Table 26
(continued)

Campus Organization for Retention (continued):		Attrition Rate 0-25%	26-35%	36-50%	51% +	Total
Initial Moving Force Behind Retention Efforts (Mentioned by at least 10% of Respondents)	n =	44	55	54	12	165
President		61.4%	50.9%	68.5%	66.7%	60.6%
Vice-President for Academic Affairs		52.3	56.4	57.4	58.3	55.8
Vice-President of Student Affairs		54.6	41.8	44.4	50.0	46.7
Faculty		13.6	18.2	11.1	00.0	13.3
Admissions		22.7	18.2	20.4	16.7	20.0
Counseling Services		13.6	20.0	11.1	16.7	15.1
Problems Encountered in Retention Effort: (Mentioned by Approximately 50% of Respondents in Sample)	n =	44	55	54	12	165
Lack of staff		61.4%	56.4%	59.3%	33.3%	57.0%
Insufficient data		52.3	54.6	61.1	50.0	55.8
Lack of funds		45.5	50.9	55.6	41.7	50.3
Lack of time		45.5	47.3	59.3	33.3	49.7
Activities to Improve Retention Since 1980:	n =	44	55	54	12	165
No special programs		4.6%	3.6%	5.6%	0.0%	4.2%
Special orientation activities		75.5	81.8	66.7	83.3	75.2
Improvement or redevelopment of academic advising program		79.6	72.7	77.8	75.0	76.4

Table 26
(continued)

	Attrition Rate				
	0-25%	26-35%	36-50%	51% +	Total
Activities to Improve Retention Since 1980: (continued)					
Curricular innovations in credit programs	63.6	63.6	70.4	75.0	66.7
New noncredit course offerings	54.6	43.6	42.6	50.0	46.7
Establishment of early warning systems	75.0	72.7	66.7	58.3	70.3
Special counseling programs	45.5	29.1	31.5	41.7	35.2
New administrative structures	9.1	7.3	13.0	8.3	9.7
New or revitalized extracurricular activities	38.6	32.7	25.9	16.7	30.9
Expanded academic support/enrichment/learning services	45.5	40.0	37.0	58.3	41.8
Formal remedial courses	59.1	49.1	64.8	83.3	59.4
Special or required services for students who have not declared a major	36.4	29.1	33.3	16.7	31.5
Expanded placement services	18.2	14.6	18.5	25.0	17.6
Job-related training programs	11.4	21.8	16.7	16.7	17.0
Faculty/instructional development programs	29.6	36.4	40.7	33.3	35.8
Formal inclusion of advising effectiveness in faculty promotion and tenure decisions	15.9	21.8	13.0	16.7	17.0
Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student-institutional "fit"	43.2	29.1	22.2	8.3	29.1
Exit interviews conducted	40.9	34.6	40.7	25.0	37.6
Use of students as peer advisors and counselors	63.6	50.9	50.0	66.7	55.2

Table 26
(continued)

Activities to Improve Retention Since 1980: (continued)	Attrition Rate 0-25%	26-35%	36-50%	51% +	Total
Involvement of students in administration, curricular design, other traditionally "non-student" activities	20.5	21.8	22.2	25.0	21.8
Special and significant services designed to retain:					
adult learners	25.0	29.1	25.9	16.7	26.1
commuting students	18.2	14.6	11.1	00.0	13.3
minority students	43.2	43.6	31.5	25.0	38.2
Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student retention	29.6	18.2	25.9	00.0	22.4

Analyzing the Impact of Campus Organization for Retention

This section is a brief examination of whether the administrative assignment of retention responsibilities is related to perception of the campus environment and activities on campus aimed at improving retention. It will be interesting to determine whether institutions having assigned no one to coordinate retention differ from the others and whether the particular arrangement for coordination matters. Creating a new staff position would seem to indicate the strongest commitment to increasing retention, and institutions choosing this arrangement should differ most sharply from those having no retention coordinator.

Before turning to this analysis, however, it will help to review the relative distribution of these organizational features.

- 42.6 percent of institutions with no one assigned to coordinate retention had a retention steering committee, and 45.3 percent of institutions with a retention steering committee have no one assigned to coordinate retention.

- 54.6 percent of the institutions that created a new position to coordinate retention efforts on campus had a retention steering committee, but only 6.3 percent of institutions with a retention steering committee chose to create a new position.

- 73.1 percent of the institutions that assigned retention coordinator duties to existing staff members from several areas had a retention steering committee, and about 1 in 5 of the institutions with a retention steering committee chose this organizational option.

- 76.9 percent of the institutions that assigned duties for retention coordinator to one existing staff position also had a retention steering committee, and 42.1 percent of institutions with these committees have designated an existing staff position as retention coordinator.

Analysis on Campus

Table 27 reports the responses according to assignment of retention coordination activities and whether the campus had a retention steering committee.

Almost all of the institutions responding to both sets of items in the cross-tabulations report that at least one analytical study of retention has been conducted on their campuses. Institutions that have chosen to assign retention coordination responsibilities to existing staff from several areas have the lowest rate of completed studies. These institutions also have the highest rate of studies currently underway, in the planning stages, and "needed but not planned."

Institutions having no one assigned to the position of retention coordinator do not differ greatly from others with respect to retention analyses, but they do seem to be lagging a bit behind. Of the campuses where no one is assigned to coordinate retention, smaller percentages have conducted studies, are currently conducting studies, or have plans to conduct a study. And, institutions with no coordinator are more likely to report that a study is needed but not yet planned.

Institutions that have no retention coordinator are least likely to have surveyed any segment of the campus community. The two groups most frequently targeted for surveys by these institutions are current students and former students who have never graduated. These two groups are equally likely to be surveyed by institutions without retention coordinators. This contrasts with the finding that institutions having coordinators--no matter what the organizational arrangement--are most likely to survey current students, but former students are surveyed by a considerably smaller set of institutions. Institutions having no retention coordinator are surveying former students at about the same rate as institutions with coordinators.

Institutions assigning existing staff from several areas to coordinate retention seem to have the best overall group coverage with their surveys. Institutions that have created a new position to coordinate retention appear relatively strong in the area of faculty and staff surveys. Institutions that chose to assign retention coordinating responsibilities to an existing staff position seem to be rather lacking, aside from surveys of current students, non-graduating former students, and alumni. The distribution for these institutions with one existing staff member in charge is most similar to that of institutions having no one assigned.

The Attrition Milieu

Institutions with existing staff from several areas assigned to coordinate retention gave the highest average importance rating to 10 of the 17 negative

characteristics often associated with student attrition. Institutions having created a new position for this purpose compose the group having the second largest number of highest average scores for these negative characteristics.

Assignment of retention coordination to one existing staff position is most often associated with having the lowest average importance score, followed by having a new position created to carry out the duties.

The negative factor rated as the most important contribution to attrition on campuses with no retention coordinator is conflict between class and job. This is also rated highest by institutions that created a new position for retention coordinator. It is rather surprising that institutions having the two arrangements that are most different in administrative organization perceive the same factor to be the major contributor to an attrition environment on their campuses. Further, institutions assigning retention responsibilities to existing staff--to one position or several positions--perceive inadequate academic advising to be the most important negative factor on campus.

The Retention Milieu

Institutions choosing to assign retention duties to an existing staff position have the highest average importance rating on 5 of the 10 campus characteristics most often associated with increasing student retention. The lowest average importance scores are most frequently found for institutions that created a new position to coordinate retention and institutions that assigned existing staff from several areas to this task.

Institutions that created a new position for coordination of retention stand out in their evaluation of the campus environment. They place high importance on 7 of 17 attrition-related factors and low importance on 5 of 10 retention-related factors. Whatever the causal pattern, there is a clear relationship between this organizational arrangement of retention administration and the existing negative perceptions of the campus milieu for retention.

The highest positive rating given by institutions with one existing staff position assigned to coordinate retention is a caring attitude of faculty and staff. This retention-promoting attribute is also rated highest by institutions that created a new position and those that have no one assigned to coordinate retention. It is interesting to note that while a caring attitude of faculty and staff has the highest average score of any positive factor for institutions with a new position created to coordinate retention, the average score for that group of institutions is the lowest for any organizational arrangement.

Dropout Indicators

Low academic achievement has the highest average score as an indicator of the potential to dropout for institutions in every category examined here. With only one exception, commuters are perceived to have the lowest dropout potential of any of the seven factors presented. The exception holds for institutions that created a new position for retention coordination, and those institutions rated the dropout potential of first generation college attenders lower than for commuters.

Reporting Line for Retention Coordinator

There seems to be a definite pattern to the organization of retention coordination. Of the three arrangements for assigning retention coordination duties examined here, the president is most likely to head the reporting line for institutions having made the assignment to one existing staff position. The academic vice president or provost is the most frequent choice to head the retention reporting line, no matter what the organizational arrangement, but institutions having assigned staff from several areas to coordinate retention are those most often found to choose this combination. The vice president of student affairs is the least frequently chosen position to head the retention reporting line, but that arrangement is most often associated with the creation of a new position to coordinate retention.

Initial Moving Force

The president is most often mentioned as the catalyst for the campus retention effort no matter how coordination responsibilities are assigned or even if any assignment is made. Institutions having no retention coordinator, however, are less likely to identify any of the positions as an initial moving force although these institutions do identify admissions and counseling services personnel more frequently than those with one existing staff person in charge of retention coordination.

Problems Encountered

Institutions assigning retention coordination responsibilities to one existing staff position are, in general, those least likely to report problems for their retention efforts. Of the most frequently reported problems, however, 60.4 percent of institutions having one existing staff position to coordinate retention named insufficient data as a problem encountered on their campuses.

Institutions using existing staff from several areas to coordinate their retention efforts have the highest rate of problems reported--higher even than for institutions with no one assigned to coordinate the efforts. Lack of staff is the problem mentioned most often by the institutions with no coordinator.

Institutions that have assigned retention duties to a new position report the highest incidence of problems resulting from insufficient data. Eighty-two percent of those institutions experienced this problem in their retention efforts. On the other hand, very few of this group of institutions experienced problems resulting from lack of time.

Specific Retention Activities

In Table 25, only 4.4 percent of the institutions responding to the survey reported that no special programs have been implemented since 1980 to improve retention. Of that number, none has a coordinator of retention. Institutions having no one assigned to coordinate retention also have the lowest reporting rate for 11 of the 23 activity or program areas.

The highest reporting rates are associated with institutions that created a new position to take charge of coordinating the retention effort on campus. This group has the highest percentage of institutions reporting activities in 10 of the 23 areas. One-third of both these institutions with a new position and of those using one existing staff position to coordinate retention report activities in 16 of the 23 program areas. This is twice the number of activities with that rate of institutional involvement reported where no one is responsible for coordinating retention.

Table 27

CAMPUS ORGANIZATION FOR RETENTION

Analysis On Campus:		One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
-Have conducted 1 or more analytical studies of attrition and retention	% =	100.0%	95.2%	100.0%	97.1%	98.6%
	n* =	41	21	10	69	72
-Now conducting such a study	% =	37.7	44.4	27.3	22.6	34.7
	n =	53	27	11	102	95
-Planning to conduct a study	% =	18.9	37.0	27.3	20.6	22.1
	n =	53	27	11	102	95
-See need for a study, but no action	% =	7.6	14.8	9.1	13.7	6.3
	n =	53	27	11	102	95
-See no need for a study and no plans to do so	% =	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	n =	53	27	11	102	95
Study included survey of one or more groups	% =	85.4%	87.5%	90.0%	78.2%	83.0%
	n =	48	24	10	102	95
Perspective students		18.9	44.4	27.3	24.5	26.3
Current students		64.2	81.5	72.7	54.9	68.4
Former students who did not graduate		47.2	55.6	54.6	54.9	63.2
Re-enrollers (stopouts who have re-enrolled)		17.0	33.3	18.2	15.7	17.9
Alumni		24.5	40.7	18.2	22.6	26.3
Faculty		11.3	22.2	27.3	9.8	13.7
Administrators		7.6	14.8	9.1	7.8	10.5
Staff		5.7	14.8	18.2	3.9	8.4
Others		11.3	11.1	9.1	4.9	10.5

Table 27
(continued)

Analysis On Campus:		One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
Negative Campus Characteristics						
Lack of faculty care and concern for students	Av =	2.40	2.75	2.50	2.54	2.51
	n =	48	24	10	87	83
Lack of staff care and concern for students	Av =	2.40	2.50	2.60	2.30	2.37
	n =	48	24	10	86	82
Quality of teaching is not consistently high	Av =	2.06	2.25	2.10	2.20	2.15
	n =	48	24	10	86	82
Inadequate academic advising	Av =	3.54	3.92	3.80	3.23	3.54
	n =	48	24	10	88	83
Inadequate counseling support system	Av =	2.81	2.88	2.60	2.76	2.77
	n =	48	24	10	87	82
Inadequate academic support services, learning centers and similar resources	Av =	2.55	2.67	3.10	2.57	2.62
	n =	47	24	10	87	82
Inadequate financial aid	Av =	3.29	3.33	3.00	3.28	3.43
	n =	49	24	10	88	84
Inadequate part-time employment opportunities	Av =	2.77	2.58	2.90	2.57	2.72
	n =	48	24	10	89	83
Inadequate career planning services	Av =	2.23	2.42	1.90	2.24	2.28
	n =	48	24	10	87	82
Inadequate extracurricular programs	Av =	2.37	2.46	2.90	2.47	2.37
	n =	49	24	10	88	84
Inadequate curricular offerings	Av =	2.46	2.63	3.00	2.82	2.60
	n =	50	24	10	89	85

Table 27
(continued)

Analysis On Campus:		One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
Negative Campus Characteristics (continued)						
Restrictive rules and regulations governing student behavior	Av =	1.43	1.33	1.50	1.39	1.39
	n =	49	24	10	89	84
Unsatisfactory living accommodations	Av =	2.43	2.77	2.30	2.19	2.31
	n =	48	22	10	86	83
Inadequate personal contact between students and faculty	Av =	2.85	3.26	2.90	2.67	2.94
	n =	48	23	10	89	84
Inadequate opportunity for cultural and social growth	Av =	2.35	2.29	2.00	2.45	2.33
	n =	48	24	10	87	83
Insufficient intellectual stimulation or challenge	Av =	2.10	2.29	2.30	2.13	2.32
	n =	49	24	10	88	85
Conflict between class schedule and job	Av =	3.29	3.67	3.20	3.43	3.41
	n =	51	24	10	91	86
Positive Campus Characteristics						
Caring attitude of faculty and staff	Av =	4.41	4.16	4.10	4.22	4.16
	n =	49	25	10	90	86
Consistent high quality of teaching	Av =	4.10	4.24	4.00	4.00	4.11
	n =	49	25	10	90	86
Consistent high quality of academic advising	Av =	3.63	3.16	2.90	3.53	3.47
	n =	48	25	10	88	85
Adequate financial aid programs	Av =	3.42	3.16	3.40	3.57	3.49
	n =	48	25	10	91	85

Table 27
(continued)

Analysis On Campus:		One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
Positive Campus Characteristics (Continued)						
Admissions practices geared to recruiting students likely to persist to graduation	Av =	3.04	2.84	2.90	3.29	3.23
	n =	49	25	10	89	86
Overall concern for student-institutional congruence or "fit"	Av =	3.25	3.04	2.80	3.16	3.24
	n =	49	25	10	87	85
Excellent counseling services	Av =	3.27	2.92	3.20	3.07	3.20
	n =	48	25	10	90	84
Excellent career planning services	Av =	3.23	3.40	3.00	3.17	3.20
	n =	49	25	10	90	86
System identifying potential dropouts (early alert system)	Av =	3.30	2.56	3.00	2.80	2.92
	n =	47	25	10	90	84
Encouragement of student involvement in campus life	Av =	3.48	3.36	3.60	3.38	3.48
	n =	48	25	10	88	85
Potential Indicators of Dropout-Prone Students						
Low Academic achievement	Av =	4.61	4.79	4.40	4.71	4.73
	n =	49	24	10	97	88
Limited educational aspirations	Av =	4.27	4.25	4.00	4.10	4.32
	n =	48	24	10	95	85
First-generation college	Av =	2.77	3.08	3.10	2.86	2.89
	n =	47	24	10	95	84
Commuter	Av =	2.65	2.71	3.18	2.66	2.68
	n =	48	24	11	97	87

Table 27
(continued)

Analysis On Campus:		One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
Potential Indicators of Dropout-Prone Students (continued)						
Economically disadvantaged status	Av =	3.47	3.92	3.64	3.44	3.46
	n =	49	25	11	96	88
Indecision about major or career goal	Av =	3.65	4.04	3.55	3.80	3.93
	n =	49	25	11	97	89
Inadequate financial resources	Av =	4.10	3.96	3.64	3.97	3.99
	n =	49	25	11	97	89
Campus Organization for Retention:						
Assignment of Retention Coordination Activities:	n =	INAP	INAP	INAP	INAP	95
No one assigned		----	----	----	----	45.3%
One existing staff assigned		----	----	----	----	42.1
Existing staff from several areas assigned		----	----	----	----	20.0
New position created for assignment		----	----	----	----	6.3
Campus has (had) retention steering committee		76.9%	73.1%	54.6%	42.6%	INAP
	n =	52	26	11	101	----

Table 27
(continued)

Campus Organization for Retention:		One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
Most Frequently Mentioned Title to Whom Retention Coordinator (if any) Reports	n =	53	27	11	INAP	95
President		37.7%	11.1%	18.2%	----	20.0%
Academic Vice President/Provost		49.1	63.0	36.4	----	28.4
Student Affairs Vice President		7.6	7.4	18.2	----	1.1
Initial Moving Force Behind Retention Efforts (Mentioned by at least 10% of Respondents)	n =	53	27	11	102	95
President		62.2%	77.8%	72.7%	53.9%	64.2%
Vice-President for Academic Affairs		54.7	66.7	54.6	49.0	53.7
Vice-President of Student Affairs		39.6	48.2	54.6	45.1	46.3
Faculty		13.2	39.6	9.1	10.8	14.7
Admissions		11.3	25.9	36.4	23.5	17.9
Counseling Services		9.4	18.5	9.1	16.7	12.6
Problems Encountered in Retention Effort (Mentioned by Approximately 50% of Respondents in Sample)	n =	53	27	11	102	95
Lack of staff		50.9%	66.7%	54.6%	59.8%	50.5%
Insufficient data		60.4	66.7	81.8	51.0	64.2
Lack of funds		47.2	59.3	63.6	52.0	44.2
Lack of time		47.2	55.6	27.3	53.9	53.7

Table 27
(continued)

Retention Activities:	One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
Activities to Improve Retention Since 1980: n =	53	27	11	102	95
No special programs	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	1.0%
Special orientation activities	77.4	77.8	90.9	69.9	72.6
Improvement or redevelopment of academic advising program	90.6	88.9	90.9	64.7	79.0
Curricular innovations in credit programs	73.6	81.5	72.7	52.9	70.5
New noncredit course offerings	52.8	59.3	45.5	41.2	54.7
Establishment of early warning systems	81.1	85.2	81.8	57.8	77.9
Special counseling programs	41.5	44.4	45.5	29.4	35.8
New administrative structures	11.3	7.4	18.2	7.8	6.3
New or revitalized extracurricular activities	34.0	25.9	27.3	29.4	41.1
Expanded academic support/enrichment/ learning services	45.3%	40.7%	54.6%	41.2%	43.2%
Formal remedial courses	64.2	63.0	36.4	54.9	52.6
Special or required services for students who have not declared a major	39.6	29.6	36.4	30.4	34.7
Expanded placement services	17.0	22.2	9.1	17.7	16.8
Job-related training programs	13.2	25.9	18.2	15.7	17.9

Table 27
(continued)

Retention Activities:	One Existing Staff	Existing Staff, Several Areas	New Position	No One Assigned	Have/Had Retention Committee
Activities to Improve Retention Since 1980: (continued)					
Faculty/instructional development programs	37.7	44.4	63.6	31.4	37.9
Formal inclusion of advising effectiveness in faculty promotion and tenure decisions	18.9	11.1	36.4	15.7	17.9
Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student-institutional "fit"	45.3	44.4	54.6	17.7	36.8
Exit interviews conducted	45.3	37.0	45.5	32.4	43.2
Use of students as peer advisors and counselors	66.0	40.7	36.4	52.0	56.8
Involvement of students in administration, curricular design, other traditionally "non-student" activities	22.6	14.8	9.1	21.6	23.2
Special and significant services designed to retain:					
adult learners	37.7	37.0	18.2	18.6	30.5
commuting students	26.4	11.1	9.1	10.8	20.0
minority students	52.8	44.4	45.5	31.4	44.2
Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student retention	30.2	25.9	45.5	16.7	27.4

Activity Report Forms

Summary of Retention Activities by Target Groups

Respondents were asked to fill out an activity report form to describe specific retention activities or programs that had been initiated on their campus. A total of 424 activity report forms was submitted by 97 different institutions--that is 53 percent of the respondents. The number of forms submitted per institution range from 1 (the mode) to 64 forms; an average of 4.4 forms for each of the institutions contributing to this portion of the survey. This response rate is higher than the total (41 percent) for the national survey in 1979, and higher than the rate (45 percent) for four-year public institutions in that survey.

After a careful review of the activity report forms, the decision was made to categorize the reports according to target group. Ten target groups were decided upon, and the reports are summarized here. The following is a list of groups, number of report forms classified into that group, and the mean satisfaction and effectiveness scores. A copy of the activity report form is provided in Appendix A.

Programs targeted to retention of entering students are most numerous. A total of 112 activity report forms--roughly one-quarter of the total--were submitted by 67 different institutions. A tally of the number of institutions submitting varying numbers of activity report forms targeted for entering students follows:

	number of institutions	number of reports
	44	1
	14	2
	5	3
	1	4
	2	5
	1	10
total	67	112

This is an average of 1.67 activities for each institution targeting retention efforts to freshmen and transfers. In the 1979 survey, only 18 percent of the four-year public institutions reported on programs aimed at "new" students.

Thirty-nine report forms describing retention activities targeted at high risk entering students were submitted. These programs are in place in 31 different

institutions--16 of which also reported retention programs targeted for all entering students. The report forms are distributed as follows:

	number of institutions	number of reports
	26	1
	2	2
	3	3
total	31	39

Programs targeted at high-risk students in general are reported by 49 institutions. Among these 88 programs are 39 reported by 16 institutions that also have 22 programs targeted specifically for entering students at risk. The distribution of reports is as follows:

	number of institutions	number of reports
	32	1
	8	2
	3	3
	3	4
	1	5
	1	6
	1	8
total	49	88

To summarize briefly, there are 112 programs in operation that are targeted at increasing retention for entering students. In addition, there are 39 programs targeting entering students who are at risk: a total of 151 programs for entering students. That is 36 percent of the total number of activities reported. Further, 88 programs are reported that are aimed at increasing retention of students who are at risk. When this number is added to that for programs to retain at risk entering students, the total number of at risk programs is 127, that is 30 percent of the total.

Activities designed to increase retention of all students or that have no specific segment of the student population as the target are included in the "all" category. A total of 64 reports is included here, and these come from 28 different institutions. While this results in an average of 2.29 reports per institution, the distribution shows that average to be highly skewed.

	number of institutions	number of reports
	20	1
	4	2
	3	3
	1	27
total	28	64

Only 10 percent of the four-year public institutions and 14 percent of all institutions in the 1979 survey reported on activities targeted at increasing retention of all students.

Far more AASCU institutions report activities aimed at minorities than was the case in the 1979 national survey. At that time only 4 percent of the four-year public institutions described programs for minorities.

Programs targeting minority students as the goal of retention efforts are reported by 25 institutions in this survey of AASCU institutions. These campuses report a total of 43 different minority retention programs. The reports are distributed among the institutions as follows:

	number of institutions	number of reports
	20	1
	1	2
	1	3
	1	4
	1	5
	1	9
total	25	43

Respondents at ten institutions identified "undecided" students, i.e. students who have not decided on a major, as the target of their retention-enhancing activities. While there is some overlap between the activities included here and those in programs aimed at students at risk, this group was kept separate because respondents perceived the two categories to be different. Only 11 activities are reported for this target group, and these 11 are distributed across 10 different campuses.

Respondents in seven institutions recognize that the retention effort on their campuses can be improved by targeting activities for faculty and staff. Only one of these seven institutions reported on more than one activity in this category, however. This was a target group category reported in the 1979 survey, and the share of reports among AASCU respondents is equal to that found in the earlier survey.

Eight reports are included from five institutions that have designed retention activities for adult students (students older than the traditional age group). This is a bit higher than the percentage (3.3 percent) reported for this group in the 1979 national survey.

Six reports from six institutions describe activities aimed specifically at withdrawing students. Dropouts and potential dropouts were both target groups reported for the ACT-NCHEMS retention survey (2 percent and 9 percent, respectively). The withdrawing category falls between these two--conceptually and chronologically--so a direct comparison is not practical.

The final category for the current survey involves the group of activities that fits into none of the other categories. There is considerable diversity in these 45 reports. Several reports describe activities for residence hall students, a few describe activities for students with disabilities, a few are targeted to commuter students, students about to graduate, honors students, and so forth. Reports classified in the "other" category of the 1979 survey represented 10 percent of the responding institutions, and the number of reports from AASCU institutions equals about 25 percent of the responding institutions. These 45 reports were submitted by only 15 different institutions:

	number of institutions	number of reports
	10	1
	3	2
	1	3
	1	26
total	15	45

The institution reporting 26 activities in this category submitted programs for students with specific majors--6 for P.E. majors, 1 for communications, 1 social work; or, the reports are for specific student populations--3 for athletes, 3 for students receiving financial aid, and 2 for residence hall students, for example.

Table 28 shows the number of reports in each category and the mean scores for satisfaction and effectiveness of the programs. As these results show, satisfaction with the success of the program is generally higher than the evaluation of the program's effectiveness for improving retention. This overall and general trend is reversed for two target groups: minority students and faculty and staff. Particularly with programs targeted for improving retention among minority students, the respondents are less satisfied with the success of the programs than they are convinced that the programs are effective strategies for increasing minority retention.

The ACT-NCHEMS retention study reports an average score for satisfaction with success that is greater than the average effectiveness rating, and this pattern holds across institutions classified according to level and control. Both the average satisfaction with program success and evaluation of effectiveness of the program as a retention strategy are higher for the AASCU respondents than was the case for four-year public institutions in the 1979 national survey.

Table 28

Satisfaction and Effectiveness Ratings of Retention Activities

Target Group:	# Reports	Mean Satisfaction	Mean Effectiveness
entering students	112	4.29 (n=83)	4.00 (n=67)
at risk/high risk	88	4.08 (n=66)	3.96 (n=66)
undecided major	11	4.09 (n=11)	3.80 (n=10)
all students	64	4.23 (n=49)	3.87 (n=39)
minority students	43	3.97 (n=33)	4.17 (n-29)
faculty and staff	8	4.43 (n=7)	4.50 (n=4)
adults	8	4.50 n=4)	4.00 (n=2)
other targets	45	4.29 (n=31)	4.13 (n=23)
high risk entering students	39	4.24 (n=29)	3.89 (n=28
withdrawing students	6	4.17 (n=6)	3.40 (n=5)
overall	424	4.23 (n=319)	3.89 (n=273)

Activity Report Forms: Examples of Retention Strategies

The second part of this section is a presentation of 47 retention activity reports for six of the ten categories described above. The activity report forms are unedited and appear as submitted. The reports presented here were selected on the basis of two criteria: 1) the activity is an innovative approach to retention for the target group or 2) the activity description indicates that some evaluation procedure has been established.

The distribution of retention strategies employed on the campuses of the institutions responding to this survey is presented in Table 25. Readers interested in knowing about general trends in retention activities will find this information especially helpful. Because this sort of information is now readily available, the decision was made to feature activities that seem to be a bit more unusual as retention strategies.

Respondents were noticeably less likely to score their program on the retention effectiveness scale than on the scale indicating satisfaction with the success of the program. Overall, respondents included a satisfaction score on 75.2 percent of the activity report forms, but an effectiveness score on only 64.4 percent. (See Table 29.) This observation, coupled with the comments made by respondents, suggests that sharing information about evaluation procedures will be of value. Some reports are included, therefore, because they provide information on evaluating the effectiveness of retention efforts.

Table 29

Evaluation Rates for Activity Report Forms

Target Group:	% Scoring Satisfaction	% Scoring Effectiveness
entering students (112)	74.1	56.3
at risk (88)	75.0	75.0
undecided major (11)	100.0	90.9
minority students (43)	76.7	67.4
all students (64)	76.6	60.9
faculty and staff (8)	87.5	50.0
adults (8)	50.0	25.0
high risk, entering (39)	74.4	71.8
withdrawing (6)	100.0	83.3
others (45)	68.9	51.1

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
New students	New student advising folders
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Students receive the KSC academic advising policy and procedures, program planning sheets, 4-year planning models, narratives about major interests, and a description of services available.	We have clarified our policies and procedures. The folders provide students with the necessary materials for effective academic planning.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Director of Academic Advising

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High
Please explain: After one year, the faculty and staff feel that the concept of the advising folder is a very positive one. We now clearly state our expectations and provide effective materials for students to use in program planning.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High
Please explain: Our goal is to help students be more responsible for their own academic programs. They need to take responsibility then use their faculty advisors as resources. We believe that higher expectations will lead to high retention.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Ms. Merle Larracey

Title Director of Academic Advising Institution Keene State College

Address Main Street

City Keene State NH Zip 03431

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
New undergraduate students	Peer Sponsors
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
63% of the students who participated in the program were in good academic standing at the end of the semester of participation	too early to tell but should help to increase retention of the freshmen and to some extent the transfers

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Office of the Dean of Students

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: Peer Sponsors are recruited from among honor students and from the most active academic, social and professional/recreational organizations on campus. These continuing students are paired with approximately 10 beginning students to serve as information resources and informal "orienters". They try to see to it that each student assigned to them makes a successful connection or bond with the university during the first semester.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: We began our program in 1984. Each semester the numbers of participants increase, and a number of academic departments have shown an interest in using their upperclass majors or members of academic organizations to duplicate the program with their incoming majors. If the program continues to grow, we feel it can have a marked effect on the retention of both new students, who will feel more at home at the institution at an earlier date, and the continuing students, many of whom are commuters, who will have a viable method of involvement.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Barbara Jungjohan

Title Associate Dean of Students Institution North Texas State University

Address N.T. Box 5356

City Denton State TX Zip 76203

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All freshman-sophomore students with less than 30 earned semester hours.	An administrative unit called the Freshman-Sophomore Center provides academic advising, teaches a one-hour orientation course, runs (cont. on back)
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
First year retention increased by over 20%; orientation course students increased by 28%; Tutoring Lab usage increased by 12% and student satisfaction was 4.2 on 5 point scale; Early Alert program worked with 4% freshman population.	Improved freshman-sophomore student retention; increased faculty-student bonding through academic advisement and orientation course; elevated the importance of the freshman and sophomore student to that of third and fourth year students enrolled in division and schools.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Third year evaluation of program cited better coordination of all service units for freshman-sophomore students; increased retention; improved orientation and advisement of new students; and increased knowledge of counseling techniques and academic programs for advisors.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

Retention of freshmen (two semesters) increased over 20% and (four semesters) by 7%; students enrolled in freshman orientation course exceeded freshman class retention by 7%; retention of minority students enrolled in special instructional classes exceeded whole freshman class retention by 10%.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Jane L. Davisson

Title Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Institution University of South Carolina at Spartanburg

Address Highway 585

City Spartanburg State SC Zip 29303

RETENTION ACTIVITY (cont.)

an early alert program, coordinates a Title IV S.S.D.S. grant, conducts a Tutoring Lab, provides 18 hours of advisor in-service training per year; conducted minority instructional grant.

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All students	Chancellor's Coffees
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Increased communication of ideas, problems, suggestions &/or concerns by students to the chancellor; increased knowledge/identification of administrators by students.	Increased awareness of student's needs and possible solutions.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Office of the Chancellor

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain: Initiated in 1982, the chancellor holds a monthly coffee lasting approximately 90 minutes for the purpose of information sharing and answering students' questions. Other mid- and upper-level administrators attend and provide additional information as needed. Students have the option to ask questions directly or write them down. The times for the coffees include 11 a.m., 2.30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m., with the hope of attracting the largest variety of students.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain:
While we have no concrete data, verbal comments from students and administrators convey the attitude that the coffees should continue. It is believed that as the needs of the students are being addressed by the administrators, the satisfaction level of these students should increase, thereby improving the rate of retention for all students.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Sue Witschi

Title Coordinator, Services for Off-Campus Students Institution North Texas State University

Address NT Box 5356

City Denton State TX Zip 76203-5356

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
New freshmen; participation required. (Also faculty advisors: training and administrative support)	Selected faculty ("Mentors") serve as advisors and teach 1 cr. orientation course to 20 new freshmen. Overload contract of $500 to each.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
15% improvement in retention to second semester, 5% to sophomore year. Students have a helpful person to go to. Assessment of skills and program planning.	Fewer problems with academic regulations; better awareness of academic and career goals; more skilled faculty advisement.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Office of the Academic Dean, through a Title III grant (in 4th of 5 years).

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain: Needs improvement in early-warning and referral system and in data collection and analysis. Attention still needed to advisement at sophomore through senior levels, especially for the undecided sophomore. Status of advisement and of this program needs improvement in the eyes of the faculty.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain: A first, but substantial, effort. We have some trouble documenting, but attribute improvements in retention to the program. Committed to this type of approach and planning to expand it.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Richard Panofsky

Title Assistant Academic Dean Institution New Mexico Highlands University

Address _____

City Las Vegas State NM Zip 87701

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All entering freshman and transfer students.	Required Math and English testing and mandatory placement in basic (non-credit) courses, if necessary.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
1. Greater satisfaction indicated by English instructors. 2. Higher performance in these subjects in subsequent credit courses.	Policy change--Must attain "C" or better grades in basic courses before permitted to take credit courses. Procedure change--More testing, placement, evaluation, and monitoring of requirements.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Academic Advising staff, University College Dean's Office, Testing Center, Developmental Studies program.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain: Prior to implementation of this program, students were "advised" to take basic courses. Many chose not to begin college with one or more no-credit courses. Problems in subsequent courses decreased, fewer failing grades were reported, and withdrawals decreased.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

The program assisted the overall retention effort by providing students with a measure of success in these areas.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Marion A. Ruebel

Title Dean, University College Institution The University of Akron

Address Spicer Hall Room 214

City Akron State OH Zip 44325

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Freshmen	Mandatory freshmen advising in groups of 10 students to 1 faculty member
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
90% preregister with this system; they get the benefit of a faculty member's advise	The year after this program was begun the retention rate of freshmen rose 2%. Faculty are becoming trained advisors.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Vice President for Student Services

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

As a result of this program, there is now a University-wide faculty advising committee, an advising coordinator on release time in each college, and new expectations for faculty advisors combined with their heightened awareness of the need to participate.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Retention of freshmen improved after first year, faculty became aware of importance of retention and the connection between advising and retention, University Committee on Advising created out of Retention Committee recommendations.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes x No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dorothy Siegel

Title Vice President for Student Services Institution Towson State University

Address Towsontown Blvd. & Osler Drive

City Baltimore State MD Zip 21204

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Incoming Freshmen	Freshman Center Advisement, guidance, orientation
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Survey of Freshmen at end of first year showed high percentages (44% to 71%) of students who felt they had gained confidence and ability to succeed in college and who felt positive about the school.	No data yet

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Assistant to the President on Retention, Freshman Center Advisory Committee, Director and Associate Director of the Freshman Center.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

It is too early to assess the program (it went into effect September, 1985) but it is highly visible and responses from students, administrators, and faculty seem very positive.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

It is too early to be sure.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes x No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Henry Kaplowitz

Title Special Assistant to the President Institution Kean College of New Jersey

Address Morris Avenue

City Union State NJ Zip 07083

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
New freshmen/transfers and continuing students experiencing academic problems	Volunteer Tutor Program
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
75% of those participating in the program were in good academic standing at end of the semester	Too early to tell but should mean fewer students on suspension and academic probation

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Office of the Dean of Students.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain: This program was very cost-effective because it uses only volunteer continuing students who are named to the Dean's honor roll for having achieved a 3.5 or 4.0 during the past semester. Each Tutor volunteers 16 hours of time to assist others needing academic help. The names of the tutors and phone numbers are printed in a brochure and then given to new students along with information on how to use the program. Tutors may elect college credit for tutoring by enrolling in a special class.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain: We began our program in 1984. Each semester the numbers of participants increase, and a number of academic departments are duplicating the effort by using students in honor academic organizations to man free tutoring labs. If the program continues to grow, we feel it can have a major impact on retention of new students and can help continuing students by involving them in a program of which they can be proud.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Barbara Jungjohan

Title Assoc. Dean of Students Institution North Texas State University

Address N.T. Box 5356

City Denton State TX Zip 76203

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Entering Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
240 Male Freshman Residents of residence hall with image problem and high attrition.	6 returning students with GPA=+ 2.5 selected as role models and trained in academic advising, tutoring, and support services. Special target programs presented.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
% of students staying in same hall and not moving to Coed or other housing: 2 yrs. preprogram return rate 2.5% 1 yr. preprogram return rate 12.5% POSTPROGRAM return rate 18.5%	Helped in improving negative history and image of the residence hall. Facillitated hall programs and status and pride. A positive reason to stay in the hall. Recognition of "Freshman needs" and staff expansion for "Specialist" to oversee program and training.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

HOUSING DEPARTMENT INITIATED PRGORAM

Associate Dean of Students, Director of Housing
Residence Director, upgraded to "FRESHMAN NEEDS SPECIALIST"

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain: The interest in the peer counselor position was good, (15 for 6). High visibility of program in the hall and increased interest regarding Academic support programming and creating atmospheres conducive to studying. Increase in awareness and integration of other support services on campus. Positive feedback from Students, Student Peer Counselors, R.A.'s, Faculty, and other staff created support for program expansion to 4 more residence halls and increase in peer positions from 6 to 25.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: Highest return rate for upperclassmen to hall in history of the building. Second lowest severance numbers out of seven halls. No comparable data existed on year before. Too early to attribute improvement to the program alone.

Building had greatest amount of applications for student staff positions and these students indicated preference to remain in same residence hall. R.A. and Peer Counselor.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information R. Hage

Title Dean of Students Institution Plymouth State College

Address Speare Administration Building

City Plymouth State NH Zip 03264

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Currently and formerly enrolled students	Telephone contact by faculty advisers
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Students who had not enrolled the previous term were encouraged to enroll for the next term.	Improved perception of faculty interest in students and advising.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Academic Deans and faculty

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High
Please explain:
Faculty and students were impressed with the mutual appreciation of the contacts. Students felt faculty support which is necessary for retention.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High
Please explain:
Students returned to school encouraged by the interest of their faculty advisers. Advisers were reinforced regarding their value to students.

Less effectiveness was realized from calls from graduate assistants than from adviser calls.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Jerry Curl

Title Director of Admissions & Records Institution Sangamon State University

Address Sherperd Road

City Springfield State IL Zip 62704

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

EXEMPLARY PROGRAM II - starting Spring 1987 All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
120 students, (60 randomly selected from Liberal Arts, 60 from business) will be registered in block programs which include an English & Math class	Establishment of a sense of collegiality within these two groups. Ten faculty members will participate in the program.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
It is anticipated that creating this "community" of students will augment students' sense of the validity of the college experience.	There will be a greater percent of these students who will return in subsequent years. It is expected that those who have not firmly decided on a major will select one sooner.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program

Dr. Elsa Nunez-Wormack, Associate Dean of Faculty in charge of Freshman Programs, will be the administrator. She will work closely with selected members of the English, Mathematics, Business, etc. departments.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

not applicable

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

It is anticipated that retention rates will increase by at least 10% above levels currently found within these two fields (i.e., Liberal Arts and Business)

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Elsa Nunez-Wormack

Title Associate Dean of Faculty Institution College of Staten Island

Address 715 Ocean Terrace

City Staten Island State NY Zip 10301

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All students -- alumni, former students, new students, no shows, minorities	Focus groups. We pull in sample populations of subgroups for indepth question & answer sessions.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
	Tells us what we are doing right and wrong. Establishes market strengths, clarifies weaknesses, establishes planning priorities. Validation.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Enrollment Services and appropriate representatives.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

Retention is a continuous effort. An institution must be responsive to the market it serves. Director personal feedback is an important part of measuring institutional structural health.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain:

Effective in planning and problem-solving. Frustration in funding some items felt important--adequate course sections, marketing, communications. Long term project.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Jerry Rhodeback

Title Asst. Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services Institution University of Houston-Clear Lake

Address 2700 Bay Area Blvd.

City Houston State TX Zip 77058

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All undergraduate students	Higher requirements for good standing, i.e., more stringent probation/suspension policy applied to all undergraduates, including freshmen.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Probation rate has dropped from 25% to 15.4% and suspension rate has dropped from 5.3% to 3.7% since 1983. The probation rate of freshmen has dropped from 42% to 32%.	The academic image of the institution seems to be improving.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Faculty and student services staff members on a task force which was charged by the administration to investigate and revise the policy.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High
Please explain:

The policy is a clear message to students that the institution will not tolerate poor academic performance for long. Within a year after the policy was initiated, student behavior regarding studying and class attendance was markedly different.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High
Please explain:

It is impossible to quantitatively determine the effect of this policy since other policies and curricular reform have also occurred. However, the opinion of many faculty, staff, and administrators is that the policy has been quite helpful in improving the academic quality of the institution.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information De S. Johnson
Title Acting Dean, College of General Studies Institution Southwest Texas State University
Address
City San Marcos State TX Zip 78666

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

ALL Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Returning Undergraduate Students	Accelerated Registration Campaign
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Encourages undergraduates to register for classes earlier. Promotes effective use of advisors.	Increases opportunities for planning, adjusting to class demand patterns. Reduces load on registration during August and September.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Coordinator for Student Retention
Assistant V.P. for Marketing and Student Affairs

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

This program has been successful in terms of accelerating registration into April, May, June cycle.
70% of returning students goal-committed by May 1 as opposed to 35% by same point three years ago.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

The overall retention rate at Eastern is higher than comparable institutions and reflects a University-wide commitment coupled with an elaborate institutional plan to improve retention. This program contributes to the overall success by allowing us to respond to the building pressure of increased enrollments.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information John C. Burkhardt

Title Executive Assistant to the President Institution Eastern Michigan University

Address 146 Pierce

City Ypsilanti State MI Zip 48197

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

'lease type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All (older) adult undergraduate and graduate students (over the age of 25)	Chancellor's Reception for (Older) Adult and Graduate Students
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Increased communication of ideas, problems, suggestions and concerns by students to top-level administrators; increased knowledge/identification of administrators by students.	Increased awareness of adult and graduate students' needs and possible solutions.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Services for Off-Campus Students (Office of the Dean of Students)

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: Initiated Fall 1985, a reception is held each fall & spring semester for the target population with the chancellor, vice presidents, dean of students and dean of the university's schools and colleges. Spouses or "significant others" are encouraged to attend and share their views as well. The dress is coat and tie with the reception in the chancellor's special room for entertaining.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: While we have no concrete data, verbal comments from students and administrators convey the attitude that this program is beneficial to those involved. It is believed that as the needs of the target population are addressed by the administrators, the satisfaction level of these students should increase, thereby improving the rate of retention for this target group.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes x No__

Name of person to contact for more information Sue Witschi

Title Coord., Services for Off-Campus Students Institution North Texas State University

Address NT Box 5356

City Denton State TX Zip 76203-5356

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Discipline/program orientation classes	Weekly class meetings to discuss University procedures, registration and career opportunities.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
No data.	Fewer student administrative concerns at the Departmental level. Communications with students within program/major is enhanced.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Department Chairs

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Program has been very successful and will be expanding to other departments. Some faculty resent having to supervise/organize classes.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Students concerns/questions can be addressed immediately, thus avoiding problems that could eventually contribute to the students dropping out. Career counseling helps to lessen the effect of students dropping out because of program/career dissatisfactions.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Jerry Howell

Title Chair, Dept. of Biological and Environmental Science Institution Morehead State University

Address Lappin Hall

City Morehead State KY Zip 40351

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Enrolled students	Involvement in Art, Music, and Theatre activities

IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	IMPACT ON INSTITUTION
Students involved in performance groups (dramatic, music ensembles) and gallery exhibitions exhibit a sense of belonging. They witness immediate results of their work and receive peer approval via school newspaper & student attendance.	Profs are encouraged to accompany students to performances. The arts on campus are viewed as central. Courses and performances are designed with the non-arts major in mind. Numerous scholarships are provided for non-majors to (continued on back)

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
The Arts at SUNY PLattsburgh have been organized into one administrative center. The Center for Art, Music, & Theatre brings together all arts activities: Academic (major & non-major) and all performances, exhibitions, etc. The Center has adopted a mission statement and a strategic plan. Evaluation of the program is constant. The Center for Art, Music, & Theatre is therefore responsible for initiating the program.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain: Now in its 3rd year of operation, the Center concept has proven to be successful in focusing attention on the arts and making them an important part of the campus. It is critical to balance the enrollment of majors with non-majors in order to ensure a high quality of performance. Involvement in the Arts in the Center is based on student needs, not perceived talent.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:
We cannot quantify the results just yet; however the students who become involved in the arts program exhibit a desire to return. This is especially evident in the performing organizations which audition at the end of each semester for the following semester. Raising the students' level of expectations and being able to meet them provides incentive.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Richard Probert

Title Director Institution SUNY College at Plattsburgh

Address Center for Art, Music, & Theatre

City Plattsburgh State NY Zip 12901

IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS (cont.)

pursue arts study. Attendance at arts events has risen 70% over the past three years.

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

All Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All students, particularly those undecided in their career plans.	Career Asst. Program-Involvement of five junior & senior level students as peer assistants in the Career Development & Placement Office. (CONT. on back page)
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Program is being implemented for the first time spring semester 1986.	

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain:

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain:

While specific success in retention will be difficult to measure we believe this effort should have a strong impact in increasing our visibility to students and in proving immediate assistance to them.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes__ No__

Name of person to contact for more information Christine E. Murray

Title Career Development & Placement Institution SUNY College at Brockport

Address _____

City Brockport State NY Zip 14420

RETENTION ACTIVITY

Will be available to provide immediate assistance to students who come to the office as well as being involved in a variety of outreach efforts for special populations, specifically minority students and residence hall residents.

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Freshmen minority students	Special reception fall semester; "Big Brother Big Sister" peer advisement service throughout fall and spring semesters of freshman year
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Participants in the program expressed positive reaction, especially in response to personal support and referral to academic services.	Specific program offered to minority students and their parents to assure personal support and advocacy for expressed needs. Identity with institution has been increased.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Program was headed up by Assistant Director for Student Activities in cooperation with selected upperclass minority students.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:
Response of students excellent; Black Student Association has expressed interest in greater involvement. Student Services (Counseling Center, Financial Aids) accessible to minority students.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:
Too early to attribute improvement in minority retention to the program alone; no comparable data existed year before.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes x No __

Name of person to contact for more information Debbie Craig

Title Assistant Director of Student Activities Institution East Tennessee State University

Address P.O. Box 21,040A

City Johnson City State TN Zip 37614-0002

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Specially selected group of Black, White and Hispanic residence hall students.	This program was designed to explore the myths, misgivings and stereotypes associated with being a member of a minority group in a majority institution.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Through structured exercises and activities students were given the opportunity to address some of their "misunderstandings" about minority populations. The students were encouraged to develop positive and productive cross-cultural (cont. on back)	Through greater understanding of individuals of other cultures, the students' transition into the university community will be more successful. Additionally, through greater understanding of others, students achieve clearer understanding of self.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Through the structure of the BAAC (Black Awareness and Action Committees), the professional staff advisors develop and implement the "cultural retreat" to aid students in understanding individuals from different cultures and establishing "tolerance." This is an annual activity.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

Students and staff satisfaction with the program was extremely high. Students from all three populations felt that they had learned a great deal and "had come a long way" in reducing some of the barriers that existed between the ethnic groups.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Many students come to the university having had no contact with individuals from other cultures or ethnic groups. Throughout their social development these students have received little positive information about individuals from different ethnic groups. The program focuses on enabling students to explore personal biases, prejudices, and stereotypical thinking and helps them to replace racist attitudes with understanding and respect for individuals of other cultures. Developing "tolerance" helps students feel more positive about the quality of their college experience and more willing to complete their academic endeavors.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Geneva Walker-Johnson

Title Assistant Director Institution Illinois State University

Address Office of Residential Life, Fell Hall

City Normal State IL Zip 61761

IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP (cont.)

interactions between students.

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Minority students	ISU Associates Program -- statewide network of community leaders designed to assist minority students.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
With the origination of the Associates scholarships, more than 100 minority students have been rewarded for academic excellence and others have been given the opportunity to succeed since the program was started in 1982.	The Associates network has grown from a handful to more than 75, creating a strong statewide public image for the institution.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Office of Admissions and Records, Illinois State University.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:
The concept of the Associates Program is a good one for the student and the institution in that a student gains support from and continued involvement with a community leader or role model with whom he or she has been previously associated. The Associates have expressed satisfaction at seeing the students receive assistance from the university to improve skills.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:
Although no specific retention figures for recommended students are available, it can be said that students have reported that they are supported very well on the home front as well as in the university setting. Since the Associate generally knows the family and friends of the student, the Associate can detect any hidden problems and notify university staff so that proper assistance can be provided before problems get out of hand -- academic or otherwise.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Wil Venerable

Title Director of Admissions & Records Institution Illinois State University

Address Office of Admissions & Records

City Normal State IL Zip 61761

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
New Black Special Admit	66 Special Admit black students have been assigned to a Black Alumni Mentor for guidance during their freshman year. (cont. on back)
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
First-Year Results: Average GPA of 66 Program Students: 2.11 Average GPA for all Freshmen: 2.24	To be measured in 1986-87.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Dr. Ralph G. Anttonen, Retention Officer

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Pleased with results because program students are in a very high risk group. Because of success program is being expanded to include Regular Admit as well as Special Admit students and the role of faculty contact persons and alumni mentors is being expanded.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

To be measured in 1986-87.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Ralph G. Anttonen

Title Retention Officer Institution Millersville University

Address Stayer Research & Learning Center - Millersville University

City Millersville State PA Zip 17551

RETENTION ACTIVITY (cont.)

Black alumni have been assigned to work with a full time staff member who will be the resource person for the University.

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Primarily freshmen and sophomores who live in residence halls located on campus.	Black Awareness Action Councils who coordinate programming in all residence halls.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
High participation by minority students in residence halls. A real proving ground for future campus leadership.	University benefits from the greater understanding of University policies and procedures that is developed here. Also, the leadership of campus government is improved by the experience gained here.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Office of Residential Life.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Satisfied with quality of programming but would like to increase the number of students.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

For those students who participate a wealth of information, many valuable contacts, and a variety of opportunities to gain leadership experience are available.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Geneva Walker-Johnson

Title Assoc. Director, Residential Life Institution Illinois State University

Address Fell Hall Addition

City Normal State IL Zip 61761

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Underrepresented Minorities and Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds	Students are placed in coordinated developmental reading/writing and baccalaureate general education classes
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Higher overall GPA All EOP students (including target group) = 1.67 Target group = 1.97 Average GP in GE course equal to that of all students in all sections of course	Clearly demonstrated positive effect on retention with almost no additional expenditure of resources

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Educational Opportunity Program personnel and Academic Skills department.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

Program continues to grow and has enthusiastic support

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

More than 100 course "packages" have involved over 1500 students. After first semester, approx. 59% of non-participating freshmen EOP students are on probation, compared to 33% of participating students.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No ___

Name of person to contact for more information Bruce Keitel

Title EOP Office, CO-172½ Institution San Diego State University

Address 5300 Campanile Drive

City San Diego State CA Zip 92182

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Minority students	5-Year Action Plan--Special extended orientation, supplemental academic advising, early alert system, minority curriculum development, freshman seminar.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Minority student retention increased: 1) returning rate for 2nd year increased 51% to 72%, 2) returning rate for 3rd year increased from 40% to 53%.	Better minority student retention, faculty more aware of impact of predominantly White institutions on minority students.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Dean of Academic Support Services
Coordinator of Minority Curriculum Development

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Response of students was very positive. The various components of the action plan were implemented to increase minority student retention.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

The model for student retention will be expanded to impact student retention for the university as a whole.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Francine G. McNairy
Dean, Academic Support Services
Title & Asst. to the Academic Vice President Institution Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Address 103 Carrier Administration Building
City Clarion State PA Zip 16214

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Black freshmen	Black Student Network (minority advising program)
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Better adjustment to college life, enhanced self-image	Better retention of participants (65% for 1984 Fall Quarter advisees); involvement of students, faculty, and staff as volunteer advisors.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

University System of Georgia

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Overall satisfaction is high; however, some students resent being singled out as a minority group and will not participate in the program. These students need to be encouraged to take part, especially in their sophomore year.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

Retention rate for participants in counseling and group activities is higher than that for non-participants. Reduction of the students/advisor ratio in 1986-87 is expected to produce an even higher retention rate.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No __

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Richard Amundson

Title Professor of History Institution Columbus College

Address Faculty Office Building/Dept. of History

City Columbus State OH Zip 31993

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Minority Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Black and Hispanic students	Dissemination of a publication called "The Resource--A Survival Skills Guide"
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Receipt of "The Resource" enables targeted students to have information available to them concerning specific resources--offices, persons, seminars, etc.--to assist in potential problem areas.	"The Resource" publication offers the institution's various offices a common publication through which information may be easily disseminated to targeted students.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Assistant Director in the Office of Student Life and Programs and other personnel in the Office of Student Life and Programs publish the booklet upon receipt of information from various University offices.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Students are impressed with the quality of and nature of the information contained in the publication. The institution has created a visible and tangible publication in which important and critical information may be transmitted to targeted students.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

We are convinced that to a significant degree students are desirous of information concerning problem areas related to academic success. This publication offers viable alternatives to the targeted in terms of satisfying a need for assistance. Such an effort assists in long-range retention of students who may otherwise not seek assistance.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Michael Schermer

Title Dir., Student Life & Programs Institution Illinois State University

Address 146 Braden Auditorium

City Normal State IL Zip 61761

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Nontraditional Age Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Students over age 25	Special non-traditional counselor Special non-traditional student organization Newspaper publicity and public relations brochures.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Develops confidence of students who have been away from formal education process. Creates a support system.	Persisters among non-traditional students estimated higher than traditional students. Grade point averages of non-traditionals estimated higher than traditional students.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Director of Non-Residence Life

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

See impact

(No hard data but estimates believed accurate)

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

See impact

(No hard data but estimates believed accurate)

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes_x_ No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Stephen Tibbits

Title Director of Non-Residence Life Institution Kutztown University

Address _____

City Kutztown State PA Zip 19530

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Nontraditional Age Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Undergraduate students over 25	P.A.L. (Peer Adult Learner) Project
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
80% of incoming students enrolled for the fall semester returned in the spring; 95% were in good academic standing following 1st semester grade reports.	Too early to tell, but should reduce students' fears of returning to school and increase personal satisfaction and cohesion with school.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Services for Off-Campus Students (Office of the Dean of Students)

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: Initially modeled after the traditional student Peer Sponsor program (see 'PEER SPONSOR' report), modifications were made to reduce contact time for incoming and returning PALs, reducing amount of paperwork and the ratio of incoming PALs to continuing PALs (now set at a max of 4:1). The list of 1st semester PALs is distributed to continuing PALs who can contact new students as time permits. This program is one facet of the university-wide retention program called "N.T. Connection."

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: Because this program began in Fall 1985, our statistics are limited. However, the verbal comments illicited by new and continuing students demonstrate the need for this activity to continue. As the program is refined and a larger pool of continuing PALs is developed, we feel it can have a marked effect on the retention of adult undergraduate students. for graduate

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Sue Witschi

Title Coordinator, Services for Off-Campus Students Institution North Texas State University

Address NT Box 5356

City Denton State TX Zip 76203-5356

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Nontraditional Age Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Adult students - 20 - 25% of student population	Organization of ALPS (Adult Learner Peer Support) Group
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
-students are better-informed about school policy, services, financial aid -students have assumed a larger role in student government -group support of the individual has been very strong	Greater consciousness of needs of adult students, increase in evening services, office hours, adult day students lobbying for better services for night students. ALPS has organized a state adult learners group, & has initiated several state conf.'s.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Caroline Reeves, Assistant Professor of Psychology
Julie Hotaling, Behavioral Science Student
Donna Wheeler, Assistant Director of Admissions
Susan Wilder, Academic Skills Coordinator, ALPS Ombudsperson

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain:

Response has been strong: the students have created orientation programs for adult learners, have begun organizing an evening ALPS branch, have become good recruiters for other adults in the community, and have, through the group support of individuals with such problems as day care, transportation, bereavement, divorce or separation, or academic problems, been responsible for keeping some adult students in school.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High
Please explain:

No data is available on retention of adult students as the population is a relatively new one at the school (full-time adult day students).

Counselors can attest to the effectiveness of the organization in keeping students in school.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Perry Viles

Title Dean of Academic Affairs Institution Lyndon State College

Address Vail Center

City Lyndonville State VT Zip 05851

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Nontraditional Age Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Non Traditional Students	First Step Workshops
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Awareness of campus and other activities. Better knowledge of admission, financial aid, etc.	A happier and more informed student enhanced our enrollment

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Admission, Women's Center, Financial Aid, Placement Center and Counseling Center

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

High degree of attendence, excellent matriculation rate of those attending

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

do not yet know

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Pat Doyle

Title Director of Women's Center Institution University of Wisconsin-Platteville

Address Doudna Hall

City Platteville State WI Zip 53818

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Nontraditional Age Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All evening/weekend students directly, day students indirectly	After-Hours Assistance Table
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Increased accessibility of information previously not available after 5 p.m. or on Saturdays. Provides troubleshooting for "after 5" students.	(Perceived) improved student attitudes towards the university because assistance is now being made available to the evening/ weekend student.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Services for Off-Campus Students (Office of the Dean of Students)

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

A wide variety of university literature (including major Univ. publications) is displayed on a table in the major traffic area for students to pick up. A representative from the S.O.S. Office (a student, usually) is present to give information, troubleshoot and/or act as a liaison between the school and student when an office's involvement is necessary. At finals time, pencils, Blue Books & Scantrons are available at cost after the bookstore closes.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

There has been a steady increase in the number of students utilizing this service since it began in February, 1983. Verbal and written comments by the users indicate most are very grateful for the services and appreciate the fact that a phone update is made the next business day for matters needing another office. By improving student's feelings about the university the student retention rate should improve as well.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Sue Witschi

Title Coord., Services for Off-Campus Students Institution North Texas State University

Address NT Box 5356

City Denton State TX Zip 76203-5356

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Nontraditional Age Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Non-traditional age potential students.	36 hour, 1 credit, college orientation course, culminating in college enrollment.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
1980-1984 (5 classes): 51% enrolled in college; 43% full time, 57% part time; 1985-1986 (4 classes): 77% enrolled in college; 38% full time, 62% part time.	Increased faculty awareness of non-traditional student. Facilitated in establishing need for campus Day Care Center.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Counseling & Testing center initiated program in 1980; course offered on irregular basis. Spring 1985 began offering course on regular basis.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

The student response is excellent. Enrollment in the program is growing and number of students who elect to register after attending program is increasing. Student evaluations and comments regarding program are superior. The incoming student understands college majors and regulations and has been introduced to college survival skills. Students have also established peer support group and faculty contacts.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

78% of those who registered in college returned a second year. Too early to report degree completion rate. No comparison of retention between non-traditionals who participated in program and those who did not.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Gabriela Wright

Title Counselor/Non-Traditional Student Institution Missouri Southern State College

Address Newman & Duquesne Roads

City Joplin State MO Zip 64801

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Nontraditional Age Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Returning adult students (over the age of 30)	Adult Re-entry Outreach Coordinator and Adult Re-entry Retention Coordinator provide special services to returning adult students.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Higher numbers of returning adults have their admission to the University facilitated; more take advantage of special admit program; more participate in special advising programs.	Greater retention rates and satisfaction rates by students, particularly a feeling by students that their special needs are being addressed.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.
Director of Outreach Office and Academic Advising Center.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High
Please explain:
Student surveys indicate overwhelmingly high satisfaction rates with special services for adult students--individual attention, extended service hours, information about special admissions programs, etc.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High
Please explain:
Meeting the special needs of re-entry students, including information on child care, orientation and learning assistance services, testing for assessment purposes should have a positive impact on retention rates in the subpopulation. Services are designed to meet the expressed needs of the older students.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No

Name of person to contact for more information Ms. Roberta O'Connor--School Relations
Ms. Max McCurnin--Academic Advising

Title Adult Re-entry Coordinators Institution California State University, Long Beach

Address 1250 Bellflower Blvd.

City Long Beach State CA Zip 90840

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

High Risk Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Students in "high risk" courses. (Courses with high attrition)	Supplemental Instruction. SI is designed to assist students in mastering course concepts and, at the same time, to increase (continued on back side)
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Spring Semester 1986. SI in Political Science SI Participants Average GPA 2.58 Combined D's, W's, and F's Received = 0 Non SI Average GPA 1.94 Combined D's, W's, and F's Received = 6	Increased awareness of student needs by participating faculty. Resulted in reevaluation of classroom procedures and techniques used by participating faculty. Participating students felt they had experienced an enriched program.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

The Learning Center Director initiated program on this campus. The Director of the Learning Center received instruction on the implementation of the SI program through the Student Learning Center, University of Missouri-KC, MO. Program was designed by Dr. Deanna Martin of UMKC.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Those students who attended 5 or more sessions were very pleased with program and made better than average grades in the course. The program seemed to meet the needs of the motivated average and above average students. Academically weaker students did not participate in the program with any regularity.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain:

This program does not seem to change the pattern of the weak unmotivated student; therefore, many weaker students continue to drop out of the classes. It does seem to enable the average student to increase his or her competence in reasoning, study skills and test taking. A willingness to attend the sessions seems to be the key. Participation in program too new to effectively assess effect on attrition.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No __

Name of person to contact for more information Myrna Dolence

Title Learning Center Coordinator Institution Missouri Southern State College

Address Newman & Dequesne Roads

City Joplin State MO Zip 64801

RETENTION ACTIVITY (continued)

their competence in reading,
reasoning, and study skills.

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

High Risk Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Developmental students which includes all students with ACT scores (composite) below 15	A Developmental Education Specialist serves as Intervention Counselor for developmental students.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Retention of developmental students is improved by approximately 10%	Overall retention is improved and intervention counseling as a strategy is being studied for possible expanded use.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Mrs. Maude Belton of the Learning Center in the College of Basic Studies initiated the program with the guidance and support of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Lamore J. Carter.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain:

The program was moderately successful considering its potential impact if done without difficulties encountered. Student reception was very high and faculty and staff cooperation was good considering this new strategy. What was needed was a fuller understanding of the program on the part of faculty and staff and quicker/more effective response to contact by the Intervention counselor.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain:

The strategy resulted in an estimated 10% improvement in retention of developmental students. This estimate is based on questionnaire data supplied by students who were served.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Lamore J. Carter

Title Vice Pres. for Academic Affairs Institution Grambling State University

Address P.O. Drawer "D"

City Grambling State LA Zip 71245

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

High Risk Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Special Probation (dismissed but readmitted) students in General Studies. Participation was required.	Monthly meeting with Coord. of Gen. Studies Advising to monitor progress & review study skills. Students were limited in number of hours attempted & directed to repeat courses.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Of those who came regularly, 98% completed semester; 27% achieved a C or better average for semester; 20% improved sufficiently to avoid dismissal for next semester; attendees achieved an average of ½ letter grade higher hours than non-attendees.	Students were retained who would otherwise have been dismissed. They gained improvement in the academic survival skills and established a continuing contact on campus to serve as resource person.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain:

Attendees gained confidence, improved GPA's, learned some survival strategies. Many were able to avoid dismissal from next semester. Referrals were made to other campus services (counseling, financial aid, tutoring, academic skills development placement).

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Considering the high-risk characteristics of the group, the % of retained was better than expected, as was the % of students achieving a C or better for the semester.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Sandra J. Hermann

Title Coordinator of General Studies and Advising Institution University of Southern Indiana

Address 8600 University Boulevard

City Evansville State IN Zip 47712

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

High Risk Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Students with low ACT scores, poor past achievement, and a lack of study skills and personal adjustments.	Peer Counseling-Tutoring Program. On a voluntary basis, these students were matched with an honor student in their major for weekly contacts.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
In the Spring 1986 semester, 28 students completed the program. 25% (7) returned in good standing. 35% (1) remained on probation 60% (17) were suspended 10% (3) had no data available	It is expected that students performed better as a result of these contacts. The retention of some students was good for the university.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Counselors in the Junior Division
The Gamma Beta Phi Honor Society

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain:

The matching of low achievement students with honor students appeared to positively affect the attitudes and perspectives of both groups. The sharing of information was helpful to the recipients and reinforcing to the honor students.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 (3) 4 5 High

Please explain:

The numbers appear to be low on retention for students who participated in the program. (Only 25%) One must remember that the target population was low ability college students, many of whom were on repeated probation and suspension appeal.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Margaret Hargroder

Title Director of Junior Division Institution University of Southwestern Louisiana

Address P.O. Box 41650

City Lafayette State LA Zip 70504

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

High Risk Students

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Students with study skills deficiency; students with low college GPA	CSC 220 - Methods of Learning Course
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
A large measure of student satisfaction with the course. Growing student demand for more classes.	Required course as part of the Academic Intervention Program. Work overload for some faculty. New registration procedures for students required to enroll.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Vice President for Academic Affairs

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

Significant improvement in student performance following enrollment in the course. The mean quarterly GPA for 150 students increased from 1.06 for the quarter before the enrollment in the course to a mean quarterly GPA of 1.95 for the quarter following participation in the course. This is a statistically significant difference.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

The course is an effective study skills course and has a positive impact on student performance and persistence.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Virginia Samiratedu

Title Institutional Research Assistant Institution Georgia Southern College

Address Landrum Box 8022

City Statesboro State GA Zip 30460

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Others

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
ESL students in 3rd and 4th level of Lehman's ESL sequence	Career Counseling course with internships adapted to serve as motivator for ESL students
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Heightened self-awareness and self-confidence among a group of students with a traditionally very low rate of retention. 60 students per year are involved.	This is part of a coordinated effort to increase retention of Hispanic ESL students.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Mr. Joseph Enright, Director of Career Services and Cooperative Education. Prof. Lisabeth Paravisini, Director Lehman College Bilingual Program, Chair, Department of Puerto Rican Studies

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

High student demand for entering the course despite very stringent course requirements. Students report heightened motivation for mastering English based on increased self-awareness and self-confidence.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Anecdotal evidence shows a much higher percentage of ESL students taking this course who persevere at Lehman compared to ESL students who do not take it. No hard data exist as yet to verify this observation.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Joseph Enright

Title Director of Career Services Institution Lehman College

Address Office of Career Services

City Bronx State NY Zip 10468

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Others

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Specific segments of undergraduate student body	Tracking format and a system of incentives to ensure re-enrollment
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Target groups (athletes, minority students, campus leaders, academically talented and student employees) increased rate of return	Ensure reenrollment by key segments by July 1 of each year Allowed better tracking and planning

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

President's office

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Provides information to institution and articulates the retention objective to coaches, campus employers, student activities staff and other campus offices.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

The overall retention rate at Eastern is higher than comparable institutions and reflects a University-wide commitment coupled with an elaborate institutional plan to improve retention. This program has allowed us to monitor retention by key enrollment segment and couple retention activities with our University goals in affirmative action, athletics, leadership development, etc.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes x No__

Name of person to contact for more information John C. Burkhardt

Title Executive Assistant to the President Institution Eastern Michigan University

Address 146 Pierce

City Ypsilanti State MI Zip 48197

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Others

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Business Majors and Pre-Business Majors	Designated a residence hall which provides students interested in a business career with an atmosphere where they can interact with other business students (cont. on back)
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Residents of the lifestyle report increased interaction with faculty and higher quality interaction, as well as greater support for studying.	Increased quality interaction between students and faculty; students able to make more knowledgeable major and career decisions due to career programs sponsored by residence hall staff.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Office of Residental Life
Dr. Floyd B. Hoelting, Director

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Response of students has been good; over 50% have re-filed each year to remain living in the lifestyle house.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Retention in the residence halls has been good; however, statistical data is not available as to impact of program on University retention.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Mindy Mangialardi

Title Associate Director of Operations Institution Illinois State University

Address Fell Hall Annex

City Normal State IL Zip 61732

RETENTION ACTIVITY (cont.)

and the faculty of the College of Business. Residents participate in special programs, faculty lunches, career information sessions, etc.

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Others

	TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
CLP100 CLP300	Freshmen, especially undeclared; Seniors, especially those who do not know how to use their majors or those who need to upgrade their job seeking skills.	Career Planning Courses for 3 credits
	IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
CLP100 CLP30C	Many choose major while taking course. Students clarify major; find alternatives in job market, improve interviewing skills, write resume.	CLP100-Students end up in majors consistent with their talents, personalities, and working styles. CLP300-Students show appreciation to college for having course w/all the personal attention in which they are aided with career and life plans. (Good PR)

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Education Department: Dr. Robert Miller CLP100

Center for Human Resources: Dr. Kenneth Hoeltzel CLP300

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

Excellent comments on course evaluation forms; tremendous demand for all sections; course has gone from one section per semester to as many as six.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain: In CLP300, a retention survey has been used each semester. Seniors are mostly past the drop-out stage, but indicate their satisfaction about course and indicate their own wish that they had course earlier in college. No official follow-up yet on wheter CLP freshmen stay in longer than non-CLP. Survey would probably be biased as CLP students usually come in without definite career plans, while non-CLP normally enroll in a program. Students have filled in numerous course evaluations which are on file which indicate that they appreciated the individual help, the value clarification activities, the personal touch, the career tests, the methods evaluation and the tangibiles

(cont. on back)

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Robert Miller, Dr. Ken Hoeltzel

Title _____ Institution SUNY College at Plattsburgh

Address Plattsburgh Campus

City Plattsburgh State NY Zip 12901

ESTIMATED EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAM (cont.)

(resume, cover letters, etc.) as well as the non-tangibles (relationship decisions, solving personal & career problems, better knowing themselves, etc.)

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Others

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
All residence hall system students	Resident Assistant and Student Manager staff personally interview each student whose midterm grade reports are below a 2.0. This activity occurs each semester.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Students are referred as appropriate and minimally have to speak to someone about their poor midterm performance.	Students perceive that the Office of Residential Life and the College are concerned and are interested in their academic welfare.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

We do have an impact--students now have a positive reaction to our effort.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

We have helped students rebound from a poor ½ semester.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Joseph S. Franek, Jr.

Title Residential Life-Student Affairs Institution SUNY College of Brockport

Address

City Brockport State NY Zip 14420

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Others

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Teaching Faculty	Two-day Faculty Conference (Town Meeting) discussing "Who Are Out Students and How Can We Transform Their Lives"
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
250 to 300 faculty participated in plenary sessions and panels on student opinion, active learning, internships, faculty programs in residence halls, teaching general education courses	Proposals emerged for next academic year on: a. better student-faculty interaction b. programs for freshmen c. academic programs in residence halls d. department chairs' retreat

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Academic Deans and Faculty Committee

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain:

Unusually high participation rate of faculty. Positive responses on questionnaires. Showed greater understanding by faculty of the demographics of the student body and of their role in retention through interaction with students.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain:

Since this activity occured last May, the effectiveness cannot be quantified. However, increasing numbers of faculty have volunteered for activities that would increase faculty/student interaction.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes X No__

Name of person to contact for more information Dr. Ingrun Lafleur

Title Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Institution S.U.N.Y. at Plattsburgh

Address Kehoe Administration Building Room 301

City Plattsburgh State NY Zip 12901

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

Others

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Staff and faculty members directly. Indirectly all students.	C.A.R.E.S Workshops. Creation of a better retention climate through a more "caring" faculty and staff.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
Almost one-fourth of the staff and a good number of faculty attended--mostly due to word of mouth advertising by participants in the workshop.	We do not have statistics yet but have had many specific reports of improvement from participants and students.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful program.

Office of the Dean of Students

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 (5) High

Please explain: The response of the staff to these workshops which focused on Coping And Retention Effectiveness Strategies was excellent. On a rating of 1 to 5, the satisfaction ratings averaged 4.5. The participants learned more about the frustrations and problems of students, discovered ways to defuse angry students, found out more about how to refer students effectively, and gained a more "retention-minded" orientation.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: While we have no data yet since the program just began campus-wide this year (1985-86), the excellent response by the staff and some faculty, the comments on the evaluations regarding the improvements which putting the workshop information into practive have already made, and the enthusiasm for retaining our students which participants have displayed makes us certain the program will have positive results on our student satisfaction and retention rate.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes x No__

Name of person to contact for more information Barbara Jungjohan

Title Associate Dean of Students Institution North Texas State University

Address N.T. Box 5356

City Denton State TX Zip 76203

Appendix A

aascu

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle Suite 700•Washington, DC 20036-1192•202 293-7070•Cable: AASCU-Washington, DC

MEMORANDUM

May 23, 1986

TO: AASCU Senior Academic Officers

FROM: Evelyn Hively, Director, Academic Affairs Resource Center

SUBJECT: Student Retention Survey

In a survey last year the majority of you determined that "Demographics and Retention" was a very important issue for the future of your campus. One attempt to assist you in dealing with the issue was sharing information through our series of meetings on "Serving the Student Population: Models for Success."

In 1979 the American College Testing Program and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems conducted a survey—"What Works in Student Retention." We have modified this survey and ask for your assistance in gathering data which we believe can benefit your campus as you continue to look at retention.

The data requested in Part E on specific action programs is the most crucial to our study. Please examine the "sample" attached to the survey and complete a copy of the Retention Activity Report Form for each program at your institution. We realize that there are many demands on your time but please ask the appropriate person on your campus to provide the information on this section and return the completed survey to Nilda Rendino, AASCU/AARC, Retention Survey, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036, by June 30. You will receive a copy of the report when it is completed.

Thank you for your help.

Enc. Retention Survey

Officers: Chairman, Stephen Horn, President, California State University, Long Beach; Honorary Chairman, Ronald Williams, President, Northeastern Illinois University; Chairman-Elect, Hoke L. Smith, President, Towson State University (MD); Secretary-Treasurer, Myron L. Coulter, Chancellor, Western Carolina University (NC); Past-Chairman, Audrey N. Lucas, President, University of Southern Mississippi

Directors: Frank H. Blackington III, President, University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown (PA); Alice Chandler, President, State University College at New Paltz (NY); James Plummer Cobb, President, California State University, Fullerton; Henry Givens, President, Harris Stowe State College (MO); Earl E. Lawson, President, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville; William J. Maxwell, President, Jersey City State College (NJ); Margaret Preska, President, Mankato State University (MN); Louis J. Rodrigues, President, Midwestern State University (TX); Beth Lentz Sorey, President, Kennesaw College (GA); Fred J. Tayloe, Chancellor, University of Arkansas at Monticello; Stanley P. Wagner, President, East Central Oklahoma State University; Del Weber, Chancellor, University of Nebraska at Omaha

25 Years of Service

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT WORKS IN STUDENT RETENTION

PART A

Your Campus and the General Problem

An important goal of this project is to determine the nature and extent of student withdrawals during the early years of college.

1. **What percentage of your full-time entering freshmen are on the average not enrolled one year later?**

1___	0-5%	2___	6-10%
3___	11-15%	4___	16-20%
5___	21-25%	6___	26-30%
7___	31-35%	8___	36-40%
9___	41-45%	10___	46-50%
11___	51-55%	12___	56-60%
13___	61-65%	14___	66-70%
15___	71-75%	16___	76% or more

2. **The above response is based on: Check one.**

1___ Actual data 2___ Estimates

3. **If you have enrollment and retention data readily available, provide the figure for the year indicated.**

	1980	1981	1982	1983
Number of new freshmen (full-time only)	1___	1___	1___	1___
Percent of above freshmen students enrolled 1 year later	2___	2___	2___	2___
Percent of above freshman students enrolled 2 years later	3___	3___	3___	3___
Total number of full-time students	4___	4___	4___	4___
As defined by your institution, what percentage(%) are full-time?	5___	5___	5___	5___
What percentage (%) are part-time?	6___	6___	6___	6___

4. **The above responses are based on: Check One.**

1___ Actual data 2___ Estimates

PART B

Analyses on Your Campus

Many colleges have collected attrition and retention data for a number of years, others have also conducted systematic analytical studies of the subject. In this section, we would like to know whether your institution has engaged in such studies. (We are also asking you to rate the importance you attribute to indicators of attrition, indicators of retention and characteristics of dropout prone students on your campus.)

5. **Which of the following describe(s) your institution? Check all that apply.**

1___ We have conducted one or more analytical studies of attrition and retention.
2___ We are now conducting such a study.
3___ We are planning to conduct a study.
4___ We see the need for a study, but have not acted on it.
5___ We do not see the need for a study and have no plans to do so.

6. **If you checked 1, 2, or 3 above, has your analytical study included a survey of one or more groups?**

1___Yes 2___No. Go to question 8.

7. **Which of the following groups did (or will) you survey? Check all that apply: then go to question 9.**

1___ Prospective students
2___ Current students
3___ Former students who did not graduate.
4___ Reenrollers (stopouts who have reenrolled)
5___ Alumni
6___ Faculty
7___ Administrators
8___ Staff
9___ Other - Specify_____

8. **Why didn't you include a survey in your study? Check all that apply.**

1___ Did not think a survey would provide helpful information.
2___ Could not locate suitable instruments.
3___ Too expensive.
4___ Available instruments not flexible enough.
5___ Insufficient time to prepare and administer the survey.
6___ Staff unavailable to prepare and administer the survey.
7___ Local staff unable to develop a suitable instrument.
8___ Difficulties associated with scoring and analyzing data.
9___ Other - Specify_____

9. **Previous research has linked attrition to certain negative campus characteristics. (Attrition here refers to students leaving the institution before graduation and not returning for additional study.) Commonly mentioned negative characteristics are listed below. Rate each of them in importance to attrition on your campus by circling the appropriate num**

Scale: **1- low importance to**
5- high importance

	Importance Low High
1. Lack of faculty care and concern for students	1 2 3 4 5
2. Lack of staff care and concern for students	1 2 3 4 5
3. Quality of teaching not consistently high	1 2 3 4 5
4. Inadequate academic advising	1 2 3 4 5
5. Inadequate counseling support system	1 2 3 4 5
6. Inadequate academic support services, learning centers, and similar resources	1 2 3 4 5
7. Inadequate financial aid	1 2 3 4 5
8. Inadequate part-time employment opportunities	1 2 3 4 5

9. Inadequate career planning services 1 2 3 4 5

10. Inadequate extracurricular programs 1 2 3 4 5

11. Inadequate curricular offerings 1 2 3 4 5

12. Restrictive rules and regulations governing student behavior 1 2 3 4 5

13. Unsatisfactory living accommodations 1 2 3 4 5

14. Inadequate personal contact between students and faculty 1 2 3 4 5

15. Inadequate opportunity for cultural and social growth 1 2 3 4 5

16. Insufficient intellectual stimulation or challenge 1 2 3 4 5

17. Conflict between class schedule and job 1 2 3 4 5

Other characteristics you consider important:

18. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

19. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

20. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

10. **From the characteristics you rated "important" (4 or 5), select and rank up to five that you consider to be most important. Enter their numbers below.**

1___ Most important

2___ Second most important

3___ Third most important

4___ Fourth most important

5___ Fifth most important

11. **The positive characteristics of a campus may contribute directly to retention. Commonly mentioned positive characteristics are listed below. Rate each of them in importance to retention on your campus by circling the appropriate number. Scale: 1-low importance to 5-high importance.**

	Importance Low				High
1. Caring attitude of faculty and staff	1	2	3	4	5
2. Consistent high quality of teaching	1	2	3	4	5
3. Consistent high quality of academic advising	1	2	3	4	5
4. Adequate financial aid programs	1	2	3	4	5
5. Admissions practices geared to recruiting students likely to persist to graduation	1	2	3	4	5
6. Overall concern for students-institutional congruence or "fit"	1	2	3	4	5
7. Excellent counseling services	1	2	3	4	5
8. Excellent career planning services	1	2	3	4	5
9. System of identifying potential dropouts (early alert system)	1	2	3	4	5
10. Encouragement of student involvement in campus life	1	2	3	4	5

Other characteristics you consider important:

11. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

12. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

13. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

12. **From the characteristics you rate "important" (4 or 5), select and rank up to five that you consider to be most important. Enter their numbers below.**

1___ Most important

2___ Second most important

3___ Third most important

4___ Fourth most important

5___ Fifth most important

13. **Some schools have attempted to identify students considered to be "dropout prone." Drawing on your campus, rate each of the following student characteristics in terms of the relationship each bears to a student's likelihood of dropping out. Circle the appropriate number. Scale: 1-low potential for dropping out to 5-high potential for dropping out.**

1. Low academic achievement 1 2 3 4 5

2. Limited educational aspirations 1 2 3 4 5

3. First-generation college 1 2 3 4 5

4. Commuter 1 2 3 4 5

5. Economically disadvantaged status 1 2 3 4 5

6. Indecision about major or career goal 1 2 3 4 5

7. Inadequate financial resources 1 2 3 4 5

Other characteristics you consider important:

8. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

9. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

10. _____ 1 2 3 4 5

14. **From the characteristics which you rated as having a high relationship to dropout potential" (4or 5), select and rank up to five that you consider to be highest in dropout potential. Enter their numbers below.**

1___ Most important

2___ Second most important

3___ Third most important

4___ Fourth most important

5___ Fifth most important

PART C

Campus Organization for Retention

The degree to which a campus is organized to deal with student retention probably helps determine the success of retention efforts. In this section, we are interested in learning how your campus has addressed the issue of organization.

15. Please indicate whether your college has assigned a specific individual to coordinate overall retention activities.

1___ No one assigned. Go to question 17.

2___ One existing staff assigned
Position/Title_____

a. Release time
(Percentage of full-time position_____

b. Overload (added to previous responsibility)

3___ Existing staff from several areas assigned

a. Release time
Percentage of full-time position_____

b. Overload (added to previous responsibility)

4___ New position created -Title____

a. Part time

b. Full time

16. **To whom does the retention coordinator report?**

1___ We have no coordinator.

2___ President

3___ Academic Vice President (Provost)

4___ Student Affairs Vice President

5___ Registrar

6___ Director of Institutional Research

7___ Director of Counseling

8___ Director of Admissions

9___ Other - Specify_____

17. **Have you had a retention steering committee?**

1___ No. Go to question 19.

2___ Yes

18. **Who has served on your steering committee?:** Indicate the number serving from each of the following categories.

1___ Faculty

2___ Students

3___ Administration - General

4___ Administration - Academic Affairs

5___ Administration - Student Affairs

6___ Support service staff (that is, food service, library, housekeeping, secretarial staff, and so forth)

7___ Other - Specify_____

19. **Who was the initial moving force behind your retention efforts?** Check all that apply?

1___ Board of Trustees

2___ President

3___ Vice President for Business Affairs

4___ Vice President for Academic Affairs

5___ Vice President for Student Affairs

6___ Faculty

7___ Admissions

8___ Registrar

9___ Academic department

10___ Counseling services

11___ Alumni

12___ Financial aids

13___ Career planning and placement

14___ Federal statistics or reporting requirements

15___ Other student services
Specify_____

16___ External stimulus
Specify_____

17___ Other - Specify_____

PART D

Evaluation

Your answers to the following questions may help others anticipate and avoid some of the problems that plague retention efforts.

20. **Which of the following problems did your retention effort encounter?** Check all that apply.

1___ Lack of funds

2___ Lack of staff

3___ Lack of time

4___ Lack of support from faculty

5___ Lack of support from administration

6___ Actual resistance to policy changes

7___ Actual resistance to acceptance of new roles or responsibilities

8___ Insufficient data

9___ Inadequate measurement-evaluation expertise

10___ Inadequate measurement instruments

11___ Inadequate data-processing capabilities

Other problems you encountered:

12_____

13_____

14_____

21. **From the above list, select up to five major problems. Enter their numbers below and explain the problems in some detail.** Use additional paper if necessary.

1_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. **To help us analyze your responses, please describe unique conditions at your institution that may positively or negatively affect student retention.**

_____ _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PART E

Action Programs Since 1980

The questions in Part E get at the heart of our survey. We are looking for examples of action programs that have been implemented on campus to improve student retention. We want to know what is happening even if a program has not been totally successful.

23. **Other than analytical studies of attrition and retention, what specific attempts has your campus made to provide action programs- new or modified services or curricular offerings- to improve retention on your campus? Check only those activities that have been restructured or introduced in a specific effort to improve retention.**

1___ No special action program

2___ Special orientation activities

a. Expanded or continuing orientation type programs

b. Parents' program

3___ Improvement or redevelopment of academic advising program

a. Academic advising centers

b. Centers that combine advisement counseling with career planning and placement

c. Training academic advisors

d. Advisory manuals

4___ Curricular innovations in credit programs

a. Freshman seminar/freshman orientation courses for credit

b. Career planning courses

c. Study skills courses

d. Library orientation courses/programs

e. Enhancement laboratories

f. Tutoring programs

5___ New noncredit courses offerings

a. Freshman orientation courses (non-credit)

b. Career planning courses (non-credit)

c. Study skill courses (non-credit)

d. Library orientation courses/programs (non-credit)

e. Enhancement laboratories (non-credit)

f. Tutoring programs (non-credit)

6___ Establishment of early warning systems for identifying and communicating with potential dropouts or stopouts

a. Tutorial services referrals

b. Intra-semester grade reports

c. Placement testing on entering freshmen

7___ Special counseling programs

8___ New administrative structures

a. Freshmen centers

b. Freshmen/sophomore centers

9___ New or revitalized extracurricular activities

10___ Expanded academic support/enrichment/learning services

11___ Formal remedial courses

12___ Special or required services for students who have not declared a major

13___ Expanded placement services

14___ Job-related training programs

15___ Faculty/instructional development programs

16___ Formal inclusion of advising effectiveness in faculty promotion and tenure decisions

17___ Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student-institutional "fit"

18___ Exit interviews conducted

19___ Use of students as peer advisers and counselors

20___ Involvement of students in administration, curricular design, other traditionally "nonstudent activities"

21___ Special and significant services designed to retain

a. Adult learners

b. Commuting students

c. Minority students

22___ Special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student retention

Other attempts to improve retention:

23_____

24_____

25_____

* * *

The information you provide in the next item will be crucial to the project. Using the form provided, please list and describe specific action programs and activities your institution has initiated to improve student retention. Some definitions are provided to assist you. Please use a separate form for each activity or program. (Make extra copies of the form if necessary.) A sample form is provided for illustrative purposes.

***

25. Please type your responses. If you give permission, photocopies of your response may be incorporated into a monograph or otherwise be made available to others. Be certain to include those campus action programs, activities, or models that may be of widespread interest. We hope to highlight these efforts nationally.

Definitions:

Target Group. The studengroup for whom a particular action program was designed. The group(s) to which a program was applied: for example, all freshman, commuters, full-time minority students, high-risk students, undeclared majors. If there is more than one target group, please list each one separately.

Retention Activity. A specific strategy implemented on behalf of a particular group or groups of students, at least partly to improve the rate of student retention (or return) from the group or groups; for example, learning assistance centers or programs, special required counseling or advising efforts, orientation classes for credit, early "alert" strategies, pre-withdrawal interviews, special training for faculty advisers.

Impact on Target Group. The concrete, observable, documented effects of the action program on the group of students for whom it was implemented, for example, greater satisfaction, attendance, performance, participation. Quantify results, if possible.

Impact on Institution. Newcollege policies, procedures, attitudes, behavior of faculty and staff that resulted from the action programs; for example, new registration procedures, new policies regarding deadline for withdrawals, new core requirements for freshmen, new expectations for faculty advising, documented changes in attitudes or perceptions.

Thank you very much for responding to this survey. We know the demand on your time was significant. Please feel free to share with us any general comments you might have on the survey or on the topic of retention.

You will receive a summary report of the results of the study.

Please return completed questionnaire by June 30 to:

Nikla Rendino
AASCU/AARC
Retention Survey
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

RETENTION ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Please type. Use separate form for each program. Please make copies if necessary.

TARGET GROUP	RETENTION ACTIVITY
Sophomore undeclared majors. Participation was strongly encouraged	Special week for individual and group counseling during winter term.
IMPACT ON TARGET GROUP	**IMPACT ON INSTITUTION**
50% decided on major; 30% designed a decision making plan; 10% no results; 10% no show. Of attenders, average rating of help received was 8.9 on a 10-point scale of satisfaction.	Better class section planning in several major disciplines, more faculty-student contact on course offerings; more knowledgable major decisions and fewer schedule changes in next term. Some faculty complained about the extra work load.

INITIATION OF ACTION

Persons, groups, or departments most responsible for initiating the successful programs.

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: The response of students was excellent (90% participated), the faculty understood student perceptions and problems better, and integration with other services was facilitated (counseling office, career planning, financial aid). In several cases, erroneous information was corrected.

Estimated effectiveness of program in improving retention Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Please explain: In next year, 75% of the total sophomores returned compared with 71% the year before; 65% of the undeclared major sophomores returned. No comparable data existed on year before. Too early to attribute improvement to the program alone. (85% of the no shows failed to return for the next year.)

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes__ No__

Name of person to contact for more information_____

Title_____ Institution_____

Address_____

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

Appendix B

Other Negative Characteristics

Lack of discipline in housing	2	Health problems	4
Class scheduling patterns	5	Low grades but not dropped	5
Race	1	Health related Physical/	
Poor academic preparation	4	emotional	5
PT student	1	Transfer to specialty schools	5
Transfer articulation	5	Family problems	5
Disenchantment with academic		Job conflict	5
demanding school	5	Inadequate freshman involvement	5
Change of major not available		Family responsibilities	5
on campus	1	No major chosen	5
Enthusiasm for large campus/town	5	Want only occasional classes	4
Family move	4	Child care	4
Interest in "name" school	5	Travel difficult	5
No appropriate major offered	5	Lack of diversity in student body	3
Lack of commitment	4	Small	3
Geographic area	5	Parking "problem"	3
Insufficient course selection	1	Older student body	5
Personal problems	5	Lack of athletics	3
Wanted to move closer to home	4	Feelings of aloneness	4
Didn't intend to graduate	5	Male-female ratio	2
Inadequate transportation	4	Parental choice to attend	3
Dissatisfaction with grades	4		

Appendix C

Other Positive Characteristics

Remedial programs	5
Strong academic programs	5
Study skills strong	4
Scheduling patterns	5
Smooth registration	5
Cost of attendance	5
Specialty programs	5
Developmental program	3
College life	5
Reputation	4
Sensible controls on dormitory life	4
Academic advising center in contrast to advising in departments	4
Specialized majors	5
Orientation of students	4
Positive environment	5
Location of campus	5
Student employment	4
Community convenience	5
Small classes	5
Recreation and intramurals	5
Library facilities	4

Appendix D

Other Dropout Prone Characteristics

Low motivation	4
Unrealistic expectations	4
Immaturity and peer pressure	5
High academic achievement	5
Long distance from home	3
Loneliness	5
Poor academic preparation	5
Family and job conflicts	5
Emotionally, psychologically troubled	5
Severe family problems, alcoholism, etc.	5
Transfer articulation	5
Working off campus	5
Inability to adjust to college	4
Personal problems	4
Lack of career clarity	4
Didn't plan to stay 4 years	5
Nontraditional	4
Living off campus	5
Physical handicap	4
Student apathy	4

Appendix E

Title of Existing Staff Assigned to Coordinate Overall Retention Activities

1. Dean, General college
2. Director of Minority Student Services
3. Coordinator of Retention Programs
4. Vice President of Student Services
5. Executive Director of Records and Registration
6. Assistant Vice chancellor for Academic Affairs
7. Vice President for Academic Affairs
8. Associate Dean
9. Assistant to President for Enrollment Management
10. Staff Associate
11. Dean of Academic Development Coordinate Activities
12. Director of Budget and Research Services
13. Associate Dean of Administration and Enrollment Management
14. Director, Academic Advising
15. Dean, Admissions and Records
16. Vice President of Student Affairs

Appendix F

Others to Whom the Retention Coordinator Reports

1. Records and Special Programs
2. Dean
3. Dean of Student Affairs
4. Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
5. Minority Student Services Director
6. Dean of Academic Advising
7. Dean, College of General Studies

Appendix G

Other Mentions as Initial Moving Force

1. Enrollment-driven state funding formula
2. Outcome gain accreditation study recommended by the college state department of higher education
3. Enrollment concerns
4. Office of civil rights
5. Board of Regents
6. State council
7. Demographic information
8. Office of the Executive Dean
9. Academic Senate
10. Dean of undergraduate studies

Appendix H

Other Problems Faced by Retention Effort

1. Apathy for academic community
2. Research utilization
3. Lack of selective admissions
4. Lack of organized follow-through to committee recommendations
5. Lack of perception of the importance of retention
6. Committee was almost too large; therefore, difficult to establish consensus.
7. Lack of release time for involved faculty and staff
8. Faculty resistance to peer advising
9. Unsolvable student personal problems

Appendix I

Five Major Problems Encountered by Retention Effort (frequencies in parentheses)

1. Lack of funds (43)
2. Lack of staff (47)
3. Lack of time (28)
4. Lack of support from faculty (22)
5. Lack of support from administrators (8)
6. Actual resistance to policy changes (14)
7. Actual resistance to policy changes (14)
8. Insufficient data (50)
9. Inadequate measurement-evaluation expertise (2)
10. Inadequate measurement instruments (10)
11. Inadequate data-processing capabilities (23)

Appendix J

Unique Conditions at Institution: May Positively or Negatively Affect Student Retention

1. Supportive presidential leadership
2. Director of data analysis not being renewed (negative)
3. Favorable publicity, quality students
4. Appalachia (negative)
5. Historically black college in small all black town in rural area (negative)
6. Open admission institution; first generation college students; low socio-economic group
7. Severe financial crisis and heavy teaching loads. Therefore, survival outranks retention.
8. 95% commuters; 75% work 20 hours/week
9. Upper division/urban/commuter institution
10. Initially women's college; growth in commuter population
11. 3/4 of student body over age 25
12. International student commitment/high academic standards/predominantly Hispanic
13. Located in rural area/small town; lack of part time employment
14. State supported in competition with three other state universities
15. Best retention rate in state. Students are bright/small town/40% of students are residential
16. Disabled students program (positive)
17. Growing adult population (more dedicated)
18. Isolation (hard winters)/transportation problems/small site
19. Key person left; no central focus
20. All non-commuting students live off-campus (negative)
21. Students see themselves as unique group because institution is the best in the state system (SAT's, H.S. GPA's)
22. Location; residential; computerized registration system
23. High quality of faculty/Gulf Coast location (positive)
    Little emphasis on campus life/course scheduling problems (negative)
24. Relatively poor faculty/administration relations
25. Funding based on student semester credit-hour production encourages admission of many marginally qualified students
26. Narrow focus (only marine and maritime degrees) means that change in major equals leaving the university.
27. Mobile student body; large percentage of part time students
28. Located in fastest growing geographic area in U.S.
29. Extremely unionized campus/open admissions (negative)
30. Large commuter student population many of whom work full or part time
31. Geographic isolation/no student union/inadequate recreational facilities
32. Size of campus and community

Appendix J
(continued)

33. New academic advising and freshman center opened in Fall 1983 with special writing, reading, math labs for skills assessment/improvement
34. Lack of business and industry for size of university; practically open admissions (negative)
35. Excellent retention rate due to visible support from top administration on down
36. Due to trend in budget reduction, faculty and staff much more receptive to retention efforts now.
37. President is retention coordinator
38. Inner city commuter institution with excellent student-institution "fit" but many are economically disadvantaged adults
39. Economically depressed rural area; nearest institution to a large Indian reservation
40. All university outreach and retention efforts are coordinated through an Enrollment Management Program which includes goal setting evaluation and accountability to the president
41. Large resident population
42. Tremendous mobility of students from full time to part time and back/extremely large number of transfer students
43. Over 2/3 of students have low level of college preparedness
44. Recovering from brief period to open admissions/collective bargaining
45. No college owned housing-unsupervised off campus housing/lack of dynamic campus life, financial difficulties major withdrawal causes
46. Average student age 32/100% commuter/80% employed, married or divorced.

Appendix K

Other Attempts to Improve Retention

1. Mandatory freshman advising
2. Minority support services
3. High risk student intervention
4. Commuter programming
5. Appointment of freshmen dean
6. Faculty/staff mentor program
7. Minority student retention awards
8. Honors programming
9. Strengthened support for disabled students
10. Athletic study table
11. Longitudinal attrition study
12. Pilot quantitative analysis of a randomly selected group
13. Presidential scholarships
14. Buses to airports/stations
15. Increased orientation for adult students
16. Early identification of learning disabled
17. Dorm renovations
18. Graduate student receptions
19. Increased residence hall services and activities
20. Student involvement program
21. Summer enrichment program for minorities
22. Black freshmen advising office
23. Involvement of parents of freshmen
24. Mandated faculty contact for high risk students
25. Identification of a retention officer
26. Improvement of student database

References

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1987, American Association of State Colleges and Universities; 1987. Washington, D.C.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1985. Facts About AASCU Institutions. Washington, D.C.

Beal, Philip E. and Lee Noel, 1980. What Works in Student Retention. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program.

Crockett, David S., Wesley R. Habley, and Susan Cooper Cowart, 1987. A National Survey of Academic Advising: Tabular Report by Type of Institution. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program.